arXiv:1303.4495v2 [math.DS] 20 Mar 2013

EQUIDISTRIBUTION IN HIGHER CODIMENSION FOR HOLOMORPHIC ENDOMORPHISMS OF $\mathbb{P}^k$

TAEYONG AHN

Abstract. In this paper, we discuss the equidistribution phenomena for holomorphic endomorphisms over $\mathbb{P}^k$ in the case of bidegree (p,p) with $1 < p < k$. We prove that if $f : \mathbb{P}^k \to \mathbb{P}^k$ is a holomorphic endomorphism of degree $d \geq 2$ and T^p denotes the Green (p,p)-current associated with f, then there exists a proper invariant analytic subset E for f such that $d^{-pn}(f^n)^*(S) \to T^p$ exponentially fast in the current sense for every positive closed (p,p)-current S of mass 1 such that S is smooth on E.

1. Introduction

In 1965, Hans Brolin proved the following theorem about the distribution of preimages of points for polynomial maps in one variable in [1].

Theorem 1.1. *Let* $f(z) = z^d + \dots$ *be a given polynomial of degree* $d \geq 2$. *Then, there exists a subset* $\mathscr{E} \subset \mathbb{C}$ *such that* $\sharp\mathscr{E} \leq 1$ *such that if* $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathscr{E}$, *then*

$$\frac{1}{d^n} \sum_{f^n z = a} \delta_z \to \mu \text{ as } n \to \infty$$

where μ *is a harmonic measure on the filed Julia set of* f. *The limit is independent of the choice of* $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathscr{E}$. *The exceptional set* $\mathscr{E} = \emptyset$ *unless* f *is affinely conjugate to* $z \to z^d$. *In this case, the set* $\mathscr{E} = \{0\}$ *is totally invariant.*

Such convergence towards a unique invariant probability measure or current is called *equidistribution*. In the study of the dynamics of f, ergodic theory plays an important role. Here, it is crucial to have dynamically interesting invariant probability measures for f. Equidistribution provides a way to construct such invariant measures. Also, the invariant probability measure μ for f is useful in studying the Julia set of f.

Theorem 1.1 generalizes to more general cases. Lyubich[20], and Freire-Lopes-Mañé[16] independently studied the case of the rational maps of the Riemann sphere $\mathbb{P}^1$ with $\sharp\mathscr{E} \leq 2$.

Many authors contributed to the study of the higher dimensional cases. The Dirac measure δ_z generalizes to positive closed currents. Dinh-Sibony[9] completed the measure case. See also Fornæss-Sibony[14]. The case of bidegree $(1,1)$ has been also well developed. The case of $\mathbb{P}^2$ was finished by Favre-Jonsson[11]. In the general higher dimensional cases, see Dinh-Sibony[6], Fornæss-Sibony[15], Guedj[17],

---

Date: March 20, 2013.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37F10, 32H50, 32U40.

Key words and phrases. Green current, equidistribution, exceptional set, super-potential.

The research of the author was supported in part by SRC-GaiA (Center for Geometry and its Applications), the Grant 2011-0030044 from The Ministry of Education, The Republic of Korea.

Russakovskii-Shiffman[24] and Sibony[25]. For recent developments, see Parra[23] and Taflin[26].

However, the intermediate bidegree case, i.e., the case of bidegree (p,p) with $1 < p <$ the dimension of the space, does not seem to have been investigated beyond the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2 (See Theorem 5.4.4 in [7])**.** *Let $\mathscr{H}_d(\mathbb{P}^k)$ denote the set of holomorphic endomorphisms of degree $d \geq 2$ on $\mathbb{P}^k$. There is a Zariski dense open set $\mathscr{H}_d^*(\mathbb{P}^k)$ in $\mathscr{H}_d(\mathbb{P}^k)$ such that, if f is in $\mathscr{H}_d^*(\mathbb{P}^k)$, then $d^{-pn}(f^n)^*(S)$ converges to T^p uniformly with respect to $S \in \mathscr{C}_p$. In particular, for f in $\mathscr{H}_d^*(\mathbb{P}^k)$, T^p is the unique current in $\mathscr{C}_p$ which is f^*-invariant.*

The purpose of this paper is to generalize Theorem 1.2 by proving the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $f : \mathbb{P}^k \to \mathbb{P}^k$ be a holomorphic endomorphism of degree $d \geq 2$. Let T^p denote the Green (p,p)-current associated with f on $\mathbb{P}^k$. Then, there is a proper invariant analytic subset E for f such that $d^{-pn}(f^n)^*(S)$ converges to T^p exponentially fast in the current sense for every positive closed (p,p)-current S of mass 1 smooth on E.*

The set E in the theorem is not necessarily empty (cf. Example 11.1 in Section 11). In fact, if f is a holomorphic endomorphism in $\mathscr{H}_d^*(\mathbb{P}^k)$ in Theorem 1.2, then E is empty. To be precise, the multiplicity condition in Lemma 5.4.5 [7] implies that E is empty. Therefore, it is fair to say that Theorem 1.2 amounts to the case where E is empty (see Corollary 1.4).

The major difficulty of Theorem 1.3 is finding good localizations of the set E as in Lemma 7.4. The set E is obtained from the work of Dinh in [3] and roughly speaking, E can be understood as a high multiplicity set invariant under f. In order to handle this difficulty, we approximate a quasi-potential of the current of integration on the hyper-surface V of the critical values of f in terms of multiplicities and the distances to V and E in Lemma 3.4. We use Lojasiewicz type inequalities for this approximation. There, we adapt the idea used in [9]. Lemma 3.4 intuitively means that if a point is far from a high-multiplicity set, then the effect of the high-multiplicity set is negligible. It is reflected in the coefficient δ of $\log dist(\cdot, V)$ in the formulation of Lemma 3.4. Note that this difficulty does not appear in Theorem 1.2 since a global multiplicity condition is assumed in Lemma 5.4.5 in [7].

In addition to the major difficulty, we also have two obstacles in the intermediate bidegree cases: lack of good potential/pluripotential theory and lack of good singularity theory in higher codimensional case, such as the concept of Lelong numbers. The main ingredients in the case of bidegree $(1,1)$ are pluripotential theory, Lelong numbers, and volume estimate in terms of Lelong numbers. However, we do not have such theory in the intermediate bidegree cases. In Theorem 1.2, the first obstacle was resolved by super-potentials introduced in [7] by Dinh-Sibony. However, for the second obstacle, we still do not have a successful theory in the intermediate bidegree cases by far. Instead, Dinh-Sibony approximate higher bidegree objects by objects of bidegree $(1,1)$. We can understand this approximation by $f_*(\omega^p) \leq (f_*\omega)^p$, where ω is the standard Fubini-Study form. For these two difficulties, we followed the strategy of Theorem 1.2 in [7]: super-potentials and the current inequality $f_*(\omega^p) \leq (f_*\omega)^p$.

As corollaries, we obtain

Corollary 1.4. *Theorem 1.3 implies Theorem 1.2. In particular, the set E is generically empty.*

Corollary 1.5. *For any holomorphic endomorphism $f : \mathbb{P}^k \to \mathbb{P}^k$ and for any smooth positive closed (p,p)-form S of mass 1, we have $d^{-pn}(f^n)^*(S) \to T^p$, exponentially fast in the current sense.*

Remark 1.6. The following conjecture was posed by Dinh-Sibony for the intermediate bidegree cases.

Conjecture 1.7 (See Conjecture 1.4 in [6]). *Let $f : \mathbb{P}^k \to \mathbb{P}^k$ be a holomorphic endomorphism of degree $d \geq 2$ and T its Green current. Then $d^{-pn}(f^n)^*[H]$ converges to sT^p for every analytic subset H of $\mathbb{P}^k$ of pure dimension p and of degree s which is generic. Here, H is generic if either $H \cap \mathcal{E} = \emptyset$ or $codim H \cap \mathcal{E} = p + codim \mathcal{E}$ for any irreducible component $\mathcal{E}$ of every totally invariant analytic subset of $\mathbb{P}^k$.*

Notice that Theorem 1.3 gives a partial answer to Conjecture 1.7.

In Section 2, we find the desired invariant analytic subset E for a given holomorphic endomorphism $f : \mathbb{P}^k \to \mathbb{P}^k$. From Section 3 through Section 5, we summarize preliminaries. In Section 6, we prove the main theorem. From Section 7 to Section 10, we complete the details of the computations. In the last section, we give examples where Theorem 1.3 is applicable but Theorem 1.2 is not.

We close Introduction by introducing some notations that will be often used in this paper. The group of automorphisms of $\mathbb{P}^k$ is a complex Lie group of dimension $k^2 + 2k$ and is denoted by $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^\mathrm{k}) \simeq \mathrm{PGL}(\mathrm{k}+1, \mathbb{C})$. We will work with a fixed local holomorphic coordinate chart in a neighborhood of $id \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^\mathrm{k})$. Let y be holomorphic coordinates of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^\mathrm{k})$ and τ_y its corresponding automorphism in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^\mathrm{k})$. Here, $y = 0$ corresponds to id. We can choose a norm $\|y\|_A$ of y to be invariant under the involution $\tau \to \tau^{-1}$. By rescaling the coordinates y, we can choose the coordinate chart to contain $\{\|y\|_A < 2\}$. We fix a smooth probability measure μ with compact support in $\{\|y\|_A < 1\}$ such that μ is radial and decreasing as $\|y\|_A$ increases. In particular, μ is preserved under the involution $\tau \to \tau^{-1}$. Throughout this paper, we denote by ω the standard Fubini-Study form of $\mathbb{P}^k$. Both notations $dist_{FS}(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $dist(\cdot,\cdot)$ denote the distance measured by the standard Fubini-Study metric. The norm notation $\|\cdot\|$ means the standard norm of a Euclidean space $\mathbb{C}^k$ or the mass of a positive/negative current. Their meaning becomes clear from the context. When we are considering $\|\cdot\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha}$ on $\mathbb{P}^k$, it is with respect to a fixed finite atlas of $\mathbb{P}^k$.

2. Analytic (Sub-)Multiplicative Cocycles

In this section, we use the concepts of analytic (sub-)multiplicative cocycle and their properties, introduced in [3] by Dinh, to understand two different types of multiplicities related to f^n as $n \to \infty$. For details, see [3].

Let X be an irreducible compact complex space of dimension k, not necessarily smooth. Let $f : X \to X$ be an open holomorphic map. Note that f is finite.

Definition 2.1 (See Definition 1.1 in [3]). A sequence $\{\kappa_n\}$ of functions $\kappa_n : X \to [1, \infty)$ for $n \geq 0$ is said to be an analytic sub-multiplicative(resp., multiplicative) cocycle (with respect to f), if for all $m, n \geq 0$, for all $x \in X$,

1. (1) κ_n is upper-semicontinuous(u.s.c) with respect to the Zariski topology on X and $\min_X \kappa_n = 1$, and
2. (2) $\kappa_{n+m}(x) \leq \kappa_n(x) \cdot \kappa_m(f^n(x))$ (resp., =).

Definition 2.2 (See Introduction in [3])**.** $\kappa_{-n}(x) = \max_{y\in f^{-n}(x)} \kappa_n(y)$.

Since $\{\kappa_{-n} \geq \delta\} = f^n\{\kappa_n \geq \delta\}$ from the definition, Remmert's Proper Mapping Theorem implies that $\{\kappa_{-n} \geq \delta\}$ is closed with respect to the Zariski topology on X and therefore, κ_{-n} is upper-semicontinuous in the Zariski sense.

The key theorem of this section is the following:

Theorem 2.3 (See Theorem 1.2 in [3])**.** *The sequence* $\left\{(\kappa_{-n})^{1/n}\right\}$ *converges to a function* κ_- *defined over* X *with the following properties: for all* $\delta > 1$, $\{\kappa_- \geq \delta\}$ *is a proper analytic subset of* X*, invariant under* f *and contained in the orbit of* $\{\kappa_n \geq \delta^n\}$ *for all* $n \geq 0$*. In particular,* κ_- *is upper-semicontinuous in the Zariski sense.*

Remark 2.4 (See Introduction in [3]). The condition $\min \kappa_n = 1$ in Definition 2.1 can be replaced by $\kappa_n \geq c^n$ for some constant $c > 0$.

We apply Theorem 2.3 to our case. We are given a holomorphic endomorphism $f : \mathbb{P}^k \to \mathbb{P}^k$ of degree $d \geq 2$. It is a proper mapping. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $\kappa_n(x)$ to be the local multiplicity of f^n at $x \in \mathbb{P}^k$, that is, the number of the preimages near x of ξ under f^n for a generic ξ close to $f^n(x)$. Then, we have $\kappa_{m+n}(x) = \kappa_m(x) \cdot \kappa_n(f^m(x))$, $\min \kappa_n = 1$, and κ_n is u.s.c with respect to the Zariski topology for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, $\{\kappa_n\}$ is an analytic multiplicative cocycle. In the rest of this section, we denote by $\nu(x, R)$ the Lelong number of a positive closed $(1,1)$-current R at x.

We consider the following two types of multiplicities related to f^n:

1. (1) the function κ_{-n} and
2. (2) the multiplicity of the hyper-surface of the critical values of f^n at a point.

2.1. The function κ_{-n}.

By Theorem 2.3, we can find κ_- over $\mathbb{P}^k$ for the sequence $\{\kappa_n\}$. It is not difficult to see that $\min \kappa_- = 1$ and $1 \leq \kappa_- \leq d$.

Define $E_\lambda := \left\{\kappa_- \geq \frac{d}{\lambda}\right\}$ where $1 < \lambda < d$. Then, E_λ is an analytic subset and is invariant under f. Note that E_λ is an invariant analytic subset for f. There is a sufficiently large number $n_\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $1 < \delta_\lambda < \frac{d}{\lambda}$ such that $\kappa_{-n_\lambda} < \delta_\lambda^{n_\lambda}$ over $\mathbb{P}^k \backslash E_\lambda$ (for details, see the proof of Theorem 1.2 in [3]). Since $f^{-1}(\mathbb{P}^k\backslash E_\lambda) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^k\backslash E_\lambda$, we have that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\kappa_{-n_\lambda m} < \delta_\lambda^{n_\lambda m}$ over $\mathbb{P}^k \setminus E_\lambda$. Hence, we have

Lemma 2.5. *Assume that* λ *is arbitrarily given such that* $1 < \lambda < d$*. Then, for any point* $y \in \mathbb{P}^k \setminus E_\lambda$, $\kappa_{-n_\lambda m}(y) < \delta_\lambda^{n_\lambda m} < \left(\frac{d}{\lambda}\right)^{n_\lambda m}$ *for all* $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

2.2. The multiplicity of the hyper-surface of the critical values of f^n at a point.

Let Φ_n denote the hyper-surface of the critical points of f^n and Ψ_n the hyper-surface of the critical values of f^n. By Thie's theorem in [27], the multiplicity of Ψ_n at $p \in \mathbb{P}^k$, which we are interested in, is written as $\nu(p, [\Psi_n]) = \nu(p, [(f^n)_*(\Phi_n)])$.

We first consider $\max_{q\in\Phi_n\cap f^{-n}(p)} \nu(q, [\Phi_n])$ for $p \in \mathbb{P}^k$ for a given n. We will modify the argument in Section 3 of [11] by Favre-Jonsson. Since the Jacobian is not globally defined over $\mathbb{P}^k$, we fix local charts $U \ni q$ and $V \ni f(q)$, and denote the Jacobian determinant of $f : U \to V$ for each $q \in \mathbb{P}^k$. Then,

$\nu(q, dd^c \log|J_{f^n}|)$ is independent of the choice of U and V and is $\geq \nu(q, [\Phi_n])$. Let $\xi(x, g) := \nu(x, dd^c \log|g|)$ for $x \in \mathbb{P}^k$ and g a holomorphic function over $\mathbb{P}^k$. Then, $\xi(p, J_{f^{m+n}}) = \xi(p, J_{f^n}) + \xi(p, J_{f^m} \circ f^n)$ for any m, n. Using the following proposition due to Favre, we can modify ξ to be an analytic cocycle.

Proposition 2.6 (See Remark 3 in [10]). *For any $p \in \mathbb{P}^k$ and any $m, n \geq 0$, the following inequality*

$$\xi(p, J_{f^m} \circ f^n) \leq (2k - 1 + 2\xi(p, J_{f^n})) \cdot \xi(f^n(p), J_{f^m})$$

holds.

We define $\iota_n(x) := 2k - 1 + 2\xi(x, J_{f^n})$ for $x \in \mathbb{P}^k$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\iota_{m+n}(x) &= 2k - 1 + 2\xi(p, J_{f^{m+n}}) = 2k - 1 + 2(\xi(p, J_{f^n}) + \xi(p, J_{f^m} \circ f^n)) \\
&\leq 2k - 1 + 2(\xi(p, J_{f^n}) + (2k - 1 + 2\xi(p, J_{f^n})) \cdot \xi(f^n(p), J_{f^m})) \\
&\leq (2k - 1 + 2\xi(p, J_{f^n})) \cdot (2k - 1 + 2\xi(f^n(p), J_{f^m})) \\
&= \iota_n(x) \cdot \iota_m(f^n(x)).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\min_{x \in \mathbb{P}^k} \iota_n(x) = 2k + 1$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Also, note that ι_n's are u.s.c with respect to the Zariski topology since ξ is so. Thus, $\{\iota_n\}$ is an analytic submultiplicative cocycle. By Theorem 2.3, we can find ι_- over $\mathbb{P}^k$ corresponding to our $\{\iota_n\}$. It is not hard to see that $2k + 1 \leq \iota_n \leq k(d^n - 1)$. So, $1 \leq \iota_- \leq d$ and $\min_{x \in \mathbb{P}^k} \iota_-(x) = 1$.

Define $E'_\mu := \left\{\iota_- \geq \frac{d}{\mu}\right\}$ where $1 < \mu < d$. Then, E'_μ is an analytic subset and is invariant under f. There is a sufficiently large number $n'_\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $1 < \delta'_\mu < \frac{d}{\mu}$ such that $\iota_{-n'_\mu} < (\delta'_\mu)^{n'_\mu}$ over $\mathbb{P}^k \setminus E'_\mu$ (for details, see the proof of Theorem 1.2 in [3]). Since $f^{-1}(\mathbb{P} \setminus E'_\mu) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^k \setminus E'_\mu$, we have that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\iota_{-n'_\mu m} < (\delta'_\mu)^{n'_\mu m}$ over $\mathbb{P}^k \setminus E'_\mu$. Then, for any $q \in \mathbb{P}^k$ such that $f^{n'_\mu m}(q) \in \Psi_n \setminus E'_\mu$,

$$\nu(q, [\Phi_{n'_\mu m}]) \leq \nu(q, dd^c \log\left|J_{f^{n'_\mu m}}\right|) = \frac{1}{2}[(\delta'_\mu)^{n'_\mu m} - 2k + 1] \leq (\delta'_\mu)^{n'_\mu m}.$$

In particular, for each $p \in \Psi_n \setminus E'_\mu$, we have

$$\max_{q \in \Phi_{n'_\mu m} \cap f^{-n'_\mu m}(p)} \nu(q, [\Phi_{n'_\mu m}]) \leq (\delta'_\mu)^{n'_\mu m} < \left(\frac{d}{\mu}\right)^{n'_\mu m} \tag{2.1}$$

Remark 2.7. The set $E'_\mu := \left\{\iota_- \geq \frac{d}{\mu}\right\}$ for $1 < \mu < d$ is a proper analytic subset of $\mathbb{P}^k$. Otherwise, $E'_\mu = \mathbb{P}^k$ and then, this is a contradiction to $\min_{x \in \mathbb{P}^k} i_n(x) = 2k+1$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ since we have that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\iota_{-n'_\mu m} \geq (\delta'_\mu)^{n'_\mu m}$ over the entire $\mathbb{P}^k$.

Thus, we have the following:

Lemma 2.8. *Assume that λ and μ are arbitrarily given such that $1 < \lambda, \mu < d$. Let E_λ, n_λ and E'_μ, n'_μ be defined as above in the discussion. Let $E := E_\lambda \cup E'_\mu$ and $N_E := n_\lambda n'_\mu$. Then, for any positive integer $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the following:*

1. *$\kappa_{-jN_E}(y) < \left(\frac{d}{\lambda}\right)^{jN_E}$ for every $y \in \mathbb{P}^k \setminus E$ and*
2. *the multiplicity of the hyper-surface Ψ_n of the critical values of f^n at every $y \in \Psi_n \setminus E$ is $< c_\Psi jN_E \left(\frac{d^{k+1}}{\lambda^k \mu}\right)^{jN_E}$,*

where c_Ψ denotes the number of the irreducible components in the hyper-surface of the critical values of f.

Proof. Lemma 2.5 implies the first assertion. We prove the second assertion. We induce an upper bound of $\nu(p, [\Psi_{jN_E}])$ for $p \in \mathbb{P}^k \setminus E$ from Inequality 2.1. For notational convenience, in the rest of the proof, we denote jN_E by n.

Let $\left\{\Psi_n^i\right\}_i$ denote the irreducible hyper-surfaces in Ψ_n. Let $\left\{\Phi_{n,l}^i\right\}_l$ denote the irreducible hyper-surfaces in $(f^n)^*(\Psi_n^i)$ for each i. Then, for each i and l, we have that $(f^n)_*(\Phi_{n,l}^i) = \Psi_n^i$, and that f^n induces a ramified covering of $\Phi_{n,l}^i$ over Ψ_n^i. Let $m_{n,l}^i$ denote the covering number for $\Phi_{n,l}^i$. Then, we have

$$m_{n,l}^i[\Psi_n^i] = m_{n,l}^i[(f^n)_*(\Phi_{n,l}^i)] = (f^n)_*[\Phi_{n,l}^i].$$

For this computation, for example, see Example 3.9.2 in [2].

We first consider an irreducible hyper-surface Ψ_n^i and an irreducible hyper-surface $\Phi_{n,l}^i$. Since $E_\lambda \subset E$ and n is an integral multiple of n_λ, by Lemma 2.5, we have that $\kappa_{-n}(y)$ for $y \in \mathbb{P}^k \setminus E$ is uniformly bounded by $\left(\frac{d}{\lambda}\right)^n$. By Theorem 3.9.12 in [2], we have that for $p \in \Psi_n^i \setminus E$,

$$m_{n,l}^i \nu(p, [\Psi_n^i]) \quad = \quad \nu(p, (f^n)_*[\Phi_{n,l}^i]) < \sum_{q \in \Phi_{n,l}^i \cap f^{-n}(p)} \left(\frac{d}{\lambda}\right)^{nk} \nu(q, [\Phi_{n,l}^i]),$$

where the point q in the summation is repeated according to its multiplicity in the covering $\Phi_{n,l}^i \to \Psi_n^i$. Since the total number of the pre-images of a point for a covering map counted with multiplicity equals the covering number, $\sum_{q \in \Phi_{n,l}^i \cap f^{-n}(p)} 1 = m_{n,l}^i$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_{n,l}^i \nu(p, [\Psi_n^i]) \quad &< \quad \sum_{q \in \Phi_{n,l}^i \cap f^{-n}(p)} \left(\frac{d}{\lambda}\right)^{nk} \nu(q, [\Phi_{n,l}^i]) \\ &\leq \quad m_{n,l}^i \left(\frac{d}{\lambda}\right)^{nk} \max_{q \in \Phi_{n,l}^i \cap f^{-n}(p)} \nu(q, [\Phi_{n,l}^i]). \end{aligned}$$

Since n is an integral multiple of n'_μ, we combine the inequality just above together with Inequality 2.1 to have that for any $p \in \Psi_n^i \setminus E$,

$$\nu(p, [\Psi_n^i]) < \left(\frac{d}{\lambda}\right)^{nk} \max_{q \in \Phi_{n,l}^i \cap f^{-n}(p)} \nu(q, [\Phi_{n,l}^i]) < \left(\frac{d^{k+1}}{\lambda^k \mu}\right)^n.$$

Observe that this inequality is independent of the choice of $\Phi_{n,l}^i$.

For the general case, we find an upper bound of the number of irreducible hyper-surfaces in Ψ_n in terms of n. Let c_Ψ denote the number of irreducible hyper-surfaces in the hyper-surface of the critical values of f. The critical set of f^n is the zero set of the determinant $|J_{f^n}|$ of the Jacobian J_{f^n}. By chain rule, we have $\Phi_n = \cup_{i=0}^{n-1} f^{-i}(\Phi_1)$. Therefore, $\Psi_n = \cup_{i=1}^{n} f^i(\Phi_1) = \cup_{i=0}^{n-1} f^i(\Psi_1)$. Since the image of an irreducible hyper-surface under f^i is again an irreducible hyper-surface, the number of irreducible hyper-surfaces in Ψ_n is bounded above by $c_\Psi n$.

Hence, since we have $\nu(p,[\Psi_n^i]) < \left(\frac{d^{k+1}}{\lambda^k\mu}\right)^n$ for each irreducible hyper-surface Ψ_n^i in Ψ_n as shown in the above, in the general case, we have

$$\nu(p,[\Psi_n]) < c_\Psi n\Big(\frac{d^{k+1}}{\lambda^k\mu}\Big)^n$$

on $\Psi_n \setminus E$. $\square$

3. Lojasiewicz Type Inequality

In this section, we first recall two Lojasiewicz type inequalities: Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2. Lemma 3.4 is about an approximation of a quasi-potential φ of the current of integration over a hypersurface V in terms of distances and multiplicities of V. We prove Lemma 3.4 using Lojasiewicz inequalities.

Let Δ_r denote the ball of center 0 and of radius r in $\mathbb{C}^k$ and π the canonical projection from $\mathbb{C}^k \times \mathbb{C}^k$ onto its first factor.

Proposition 3.1 (See [6], [15].). *Let X be an analytic subset of $\Delta_1 \times \Delta_1$ of pure dimension k and s a fixed integer. Assume that $\pi : X \to \Delta_1$ defines a ramified covering of degree $m \leq s$ over Δ_1. Then there is a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that if x, y are two points in $\Delta_{3/4}$ we can write*

$$\pi^{-1}(x) \cap X = \left\{x^1, ..., x^m\right\} \quad \textit{and} \quad \pi^{-1}(y) \cap X = \left\{y^1, ..., y^m\right\}$$

with $\left\|x^i - y^i\right\| \leq c_1 \left\|x-y\right\|^{1/m}$. Moreover, the constant c_1 depends on s but not on X. Note that the points in the fibers $\pi^{-1}(x) \cap X$ and $\pi^{-1}(y) \cap X$ are repeated according to their multiplicities.

Proposition 3.2 (See Proposition 4.2 in [6].). *Let X be an analytic subset of $\Delta_1 \times \Delta_1$ of pure dimension k and let δ be an integer. Assume $\pi : X \to \Delta_1$ defines a ramified covering of degree m over Δ_1. Let $Z \subset \Delta_1$ be a proper analytic set such that the multiplicity of every point in $\pi^{-1}(x) \cap X$ is at most equal to $\delta < m$ for $x \in \Delta_1 \setminus Z$. Then there are constants $c_2 > 0, N_2 \geq 1$ such that for any $0 < t < 1$ and all $x, y \in \Delta_{1/2}$ with $dist(x, Z) \geq t$ and $dist(y, Z) \geq t$, we can write*

$$\pi^{-1}(x) \cap X = \left\{x^1, ..., x^m\right\} \quad \textit{and} \quad \pi^{-1}(y) \cap Y = \left\{y^1, ..., y^m\right\}$$

with $\left\|x^i - y^i\right\| \leq c_2 t^{-N_2} \left\|x-y\right\|^{1/\delta}$.

Before Lemma 3.4, we clarify the definition of multiplicity for an analytic hypersurface.

Definition 3.3. The *multiplicity* of a subvariety V of dimension l in $\mathbb{P}^k$ at a point P, denoted $multi_P(V)$, is taken to be the number of sheets in the projection, in a small coordinate polydisc in $\mathbb{C}^k \subset \mathbb{P}^k$ around P, of V onto a generic l-dimensional polydisc.

The details about the projection can be found in [18].

Let V be an analytic hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}^k$ of degree d_V. Let $0 < \delta < d_V$ be given. Let E be an analytic subset of V such that for all $Z \in V \setminus E$, $multi_Z(V) < \delta$. We denote by $[V]$ the current of integration over V of mass d_V. Then, we can find a unique negative quasi-plurisubharmonic function φ over $\mathbb{P}^k$ such that $\sup_{\mathbb{P}^k} \varphi = 0$ and $dd^c\varphi = [V] - d_V w$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $0 < \delta < d_V$ be given. Then, there are constants $C, A > 0$ such that*

$$\delta \log dist(\cdot, V) + C \log dist(\cdot, E) - A \leq \varphi \leq \log dist(\cdot, V) + A. \tag{3.1}$$

We use the proofs of Proposition 4.2 in [9] and Lemma 2.2.5 in [7].

Proof. First, we consider the left-sided inequality of Inequality 3.1. Since V is compact and φ is smooth outside V, this problem is of local nature and it suffices to prove Inequality 3.1 in a neighborhood U_x of $x \in V$.

Consider a point $x \in V$ and denote $m = multi_x(V)$. At the end of the proof, we will find a desired neighborhood U_x of x where Inequality 3.1 is true. Then, as in Definition 3.3, we can find a small polydisc $\Delta \subset \mathbb{C}^k$ of complex dimension k centered at x, Δ' of complex dimension $k-1$ and a projection map $\pi : \Delta \cap V \to \Delta'$ defining a m-sheeted ramified covering over Δ'.

Fix a local coordinate chart $(z_1, ..., z_k)$ for Δ such that $\pi(z_1, ..., z_k) = (z_1, ..., z_{k-1})$. For convenience, we write $(z_1, ..., z_k) = (z', z_k)$.

For each $z' \in \Delta'$, we can find m points $\{z^1, \cdots, z^m\}$ such that $\pi(z^j) = z'$ where z^j's are repeated according to their multiplicities. Let z^j_k denote the k-th coordinate of z^j. Consider the polynomial $H(z)$ defined by

$$H(z) := (z_k - z^1_k) \cdots (z_k - z^m_k).$$

Then, $H(z)$ is a Weierstrass polynomial whose zero set is V. This is a holomorphic function on Δ. Shrink Δ and Δ' correspondingly with the ramified covering structure preserved, if necessary. Then, since $\varphi(z) - \log|H(z)|$ is a smooth function in a neighborhood of $\overline{\Delta}$, it suffices to prove Inequality 3.1 for $\log|H(z)|$. In other words, it is enough to show that in a small neighborhood $U_x \subseteq \Delta$ of $x \in V$,

$$\delta \log dist(\cdot, V) + C_x \log dist(\cdot, E) - A_x \leq \log|H(\cdot)| \tag{3.2}$$

for some constants $C_x, A_x > 0$.

For this inequality, we claim that for any $z \in U_x$, the ball B_z centered at z and of radius $\frac{1}{3}\gamma_3(\frac{1}{2}dist(z, E))^{N_3\delta}$ contains at most δ locally irreducible components of V for some $\gamma_3 > 0$ and $N_3 > 0$ both of which are independent of z. Our claim works as follows. From the definition, we know that $|H(z)|$ can be bounded below by product of the distances to each irreducible component of V in Δ. Suppose that $\delta < m$. Since B_z can contain only δ irreducible components of V, we have

$$dist(\cdot, V)^\delta \left[\frac{1}{3}\gamma_3 \left(\frac{1}{2}dist(\cdot, E)\right)^{N_3\delta}\right]^{m-\delta} \leq |H(\cdot)|$$

and then,

$$\delta \log dist(\cdot, V) + (m - \delta) \log \left(\frac{1}{3}\gamma_3 \left(\frac{1}{2}dist(\cdot, E)\right)^{N_3\delta}\right) \leq \log|H(\cdot)|.$$

So, we can explicitly find $C_x = (m - \delta)\delta N_3$ and $A_x = -(m - \delta) \log \left(\frac{1}{3}\gamma_3 \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{N_3\delta}\right)$ for U_x. If $\delta \geq m$, then we can apply the same argument and conclude that $C_x = 0$ and $A_x = 0$.

Note that by the previous arguments it suffices to prove Inequality 3.2 for $x \in E$ in order to prove our claim .

We prove our claim. Express $H(z)$ as

$$H(z) = z_k^m + a_{k-1}(z')z_k^{k-1} + \cdots + a_0(z'),$$

where $a_l(z')$ are holomorphic functions of z' over Δ' for $l = 0, ..., k-1$. Define an analytic subset $\Gamma \subset \Delta' \times \Delta^m$ by $(z', z^1, ..., z^m) \in \Gamma$ if and only if the symmetric functions of $\left\{z_k^i\right\}$ are coefficients of $H(z)$, that is, $\sum z_k^i = -a_{k-1}(z')$, $\sum_{i<j} z_k^i z_k^j = a_{k-2}(z')$, ..., $\prod z_k^i = (-1)^m a_0(z')$. Indeed, the graph Γ is the set of the tuples of $z' \in \Delta'$ and all z values in Δ such that $\pi(z) = z'$ where z is repeated according to its multiplicity.

Define $\pi_0^m : \Delta' \times \Delta^m \to \Delta'$ by $\pi_0^m(z', z^1, ..., z^m) = z'$ where $z' \in \Delta'$ and $z^i \in \Delta$ for each $i = 1, ..., m$. For $1 \leq p \leq n$, define $\pi_p^m : \Delta' \times \Delta^m \to \Delta' \times \Delta^p$ by $\pi_p^m(z', z^1, ..., z^m) = (z', z^1, ..., z^p)$. It is not difficult to see that Remmert's Proper Mapping Theorem implies that the image $\pi_p^m(\Gamma) \subset \Delta' \times \Delta^p$ of Γ under π_p^m is an analytic subset. We denote $\Gamma_p := \pi_p^m(\Gamma)$. Take $p = \delta + 1$ in the following.

Next, we introduce a function roughly measuring the shrinking speed of distances among the closest $\delta+1$ different irreducible components of V in Δ as we approach E. It is a modification of Lemma 4.3. in [9]. We define a projection $\pi_0^{\delta+1} : \Gamma_{\delta+1} \to \Delta'$ by $\pi_0^{\delta+1}(z', z^1, ..., z^{\delta+1}) = z'$.

For each $z = (z', z_n) \in \Delta \cap V$, we define

$$h(z) = \min_{\substack{P \in \Gamma_{\delta+1} \\ z^1 = z \\ \pi_0^{\delta+1}(P) = z'}} \sum_{1 \leq i_p, i_q \leq \delta+1} \left\| z^{i_p} - z^{i_q} \right\|,$$

where $P = (z', z^1, ..., z^{\delta+1})$ is a point on $\Gamma_{\delta+1}$, and z^{i_p} and z^{i_q} are the i_p-th and i_q-th coordinates of P, respectively.

Lemma 3.5. *There exist* $M_3 \geq 1$ *and* $A_3 > 0$ *such that for* $z \in \frac{1}{2}\Delta$*,*

$$h(z) \geq A_3^{-1} dist(z, E)^{M_3}$$

Proof. Let X_1 be the set of points (z, z', z^I) in $\Delta \times \Delta' \times (\mathbb{C}^k)^{(\delta+1)^2}$, where $\pi(z) = z'$, $z^1 = z$ and z^I are defined by $z^{i_p} - z^{i_q}$ where z^i is the i-th coordinate of a point P on the graph $\Gamma_{\delta+1}$ such that $\pi(z^i) = z'$ and $1 \leq p, q \leq \delta + 1$. Since $\Gamma_{\delta+1}$ is analytic, X_1 is analytic. X_1 can be seen as a ramified covering over Δ'. Let $X_2 := \Delta \times \Delta' \times \{0\} \subset \Delta \times \Delta' \times (\mathbb{C}^k)^{(\delta+1)^2}$.

A Lojasiewicz inequality (for example, see p. 14, p. 62 in [21]) proves that for $z \in \frac{1}{2}\Delta$ and for sufficiently large A_3, M_3,

$$dist(P, X_2) \geq A_3^{-1} dist(P, X_1 \cap X_2)^{M_3},$$

for all $P \in X_1$. Thus, for $z \in \frac{1}{2}\Delta$,

$$h(z) \geq dist(P, X_2) \geq A_3^{-1} dist(z, E)^{M_3}.$$

In the above, for the first inequality, the Fubini-Study metric and Euclidean metric are locally equivalent and for the second inequality, the multiplicity of V is $< \delta + 1$ outside E. □

We continue the proof of our claim. Define $N_3 := M_3 m$ with M_3 in the previous lemma. Fix a sufficiently small $\gamma_3 > 0$.

Consider $z \in V$ such that $\|z\| \leq \frac{1}{4}r$ in the coordinate system of Δ where r is the smallest polyradius of Δ. Take $t = 1/2dist(z, E)$. Let B' be the ball of center z' and of radius $\gamma_3 t^{N_3\delta}$. For sufficiently small $\gamma_3 > 0$, every open neighborhood of the form

$B' \times B_{z_k}((8m+2)c_3\gamma_3^{1/m}t^{N_3\delta/m})$ sits inside Δ, where $B_{z_k}((8m+2)c_3\gamma_3^{1/m}t^{N_3\delta/m})$ denotes the ball in $\mathbb{C}$ of center z_k and of radius $(8m+2)c_3\gamma_3^{1/m}t^{N_3\delta/m}$ and therefore, we can use the coordinate system of Δ for such polydiscs. Hence, the following argument is valid.

We will show that the connected component of $V \cap \pi^{-1}(B')$ containing z defines a ramified covering of degree $\leq \delta$ over B'.

As in Lemma 4.3 of [9], there is an integer $2 \leq l \leq 8m$ such that if $\tilde{z} = (z', \tilde{z_k}) \in \pi^{-1}(z') \cap V$, we have either $\|z - \tilde{z}\| \leq (l-2)c_3\gamma_3^{1/m}t^{N_3\delta/m}$ or $\|z - \tilde{z}\| \geq (l+2)c_3\gamma_3^{1/m}t^{N_3\delta/m}$, where c_3 is the constant in the inequality in Proposition 3.1.

Let B'' denote the ball of center z_k and of radius $lc_3\gamma_3^{1/m}t^{N_3\delta/m}$ in $\mathbb{C}$ and $\partial B''$ its boundary. Note that over the fiber $\pi^{-1}(z')$, $dist(\pi^{-1}(z') \cap V, B' \times \partial B'') \leq c_3\gamma_3^{1/m}t^{N_3\delta/m}$. Proposition 3.1 gives us $dist(\tilde{y}, \pi^{-1}(z') \cap V) \leq c_3 \|y - z\|^{1/m}$, where $\tilde{y} \in \pi^{-1}(y') \cap V$. Hence, $V \cap (B' \times \partial B'') = \emptyset$ and therefore, π is proper on $V \cap (B' \times B'')$ over B'.

We want to show that the degree of the covering is $\leq \delta$. If not, $h(z)$ is of order $\gamma_3^{1/m}t^{N_3\delta/m} \ll A_3^{-1}t^{N_3/m} = A_3^{-1}t^{M_3}$ because γ_3 is small. Note that z obviously sits inside $\frac{1}{2}\Delta$ from our choice of z such that $\|z\| \leq \frac{1}{4}r$ and therefore, Lemma 3.5 is valid. This is a contradiction because Lemma 3.5 states that $h(z) \geq A_3^{-1}dist(z,E)^{M_3} \geq A_3^{-1}t^{M_3}$.

So, the box $B' \times B''$ contains at most δ locally irreducible components. The ball of radius $\gamma_3 t^{N_3\delta} = \min\left\{c_3\gamma_3^{1/m}t^{N_3\delta/m}, \gamma_3 t^{N_3\delta}\right\}$ for sufficiently small γ_3 and of center $z \in V$ can intersect at most δ irreducible components and the distances to other irreducible components from z are $> \gamma t^{N_3\delta}$.

Take the neighborhood U_x of $x \in E$ to be the polydisc of uniform polyradius $\frac{1}{4}r$ centered at $x \in E$. This is the desired open neighborhood of x. Indeed, for an arbitrary point $z \in U_x$, the ball B'_z centered at z and of radius $\frac{1}{3}\gamma_3(\frac{1}{2}dist(z,E))^{N_3\delta}$ can contain at most δ irreducible components of V. Hence, our claim is proved.

The right-sided inequality of Inequality 3.1 is obtained from the same method as in the proof of Lemma 2.2.5 in [7]. It is simply from the compactness of V. So, we are done. □

4. Currents

In this paper, we assume some familiarity of the reader to currents. For details, for example, see [2] (especially, Chapter III), Appendix of [8], [12], [19], [22] and [25]. Especially, for the topology on the space of currents, see [12] and [22]. For the convenience of the reader, we summarize some concepts, their properties and important remarks.

For positive (p,p)-currents on $\mathbb{P}^k$, the mass of S is equivalent to

$$\|S\| := \langle S, \omega^{k-p} \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{P}^k} S \wedge \omega^{k-p}.$$

In the same way, for negative (p,p)-currents, the mass of S' is equivalent to $\|S'\| := \langle -S', \omega^{k-p} \rangle$. In the rest of this paper, we denote by $\mathscr{C}_p$ the set of positive closed (p,p)-currents of mass 1.

We recall some properties of $\mathscr{C}_p$. The space $\mathscr{C}_p$ is a Polish space. It is compact in the current sense. Moreover, the weak topology on $\mathscr{C}_p$ is metrizable (see [7]). Indeed, the following dual Lipschitz-type metric metrizes the weak topology on $\mathscr{C}_p$.

A precise formulation is as follows. For $\alpha \geq 0$, let $[\alpha]$ denote the largest integer $\leq \alpha$. Let $\mathscr{C}_q^\alpha$ be the space of (q,q)-forms whose coefficients admit derivatives of all orders $\leq [\alpha]$ and these derivatives are $(\alpha - [\alpha])$-Hölder continuous. We use here the sum of $\mathscr{C}_\alpha$-norms of the coefficients for a fixed atlas. If R and R' are currents in $\mathscr{C}_p$, we define

$$dist_\alpha(R, R') := \sup_{\|\Phi\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha} \leq 1} |\langle R - R', \Phi\rangle| \,,$$

where Φ is a smooth $(k-p, k-p)$-form on $\mathbb{P}^k$.

Proposition 4.1 (See in [7])**.** *Then, the topology induced by the distance* $dist_\alpha$ *with any* $\alpha > 0$ *is equivalent to the weak topology on* $\mathscr{C}_p$ *(see* [7]*).*

Another property of $\mathscr{C}_p$ to recall is that the smooth forms are dense in $\mathscr{C}_p$. We regularize $R \in \mathscr{C}_p$ using the automorphisms of $\mathbb{P}^k$ in the following way (see [7]). Consider an endomorphism h_θ of $\{\|y\|_A < 1\}$ defined by $h_\theta(y) := \theta y$ for $\theta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $|\theta| < 1$, where $\{\|y\|_A < 1\}$ is the coordinate chart of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{P^k})$ introduced in Introduction. Define $\mu_\theta := (h_\theta)_*(\mu)$. Then, μ_0 is the Dirac mass at $id \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{P^k})$ and μ_θ is a smooth probability measure if $\theta \neq 0$.

Definition 4.2. For any positive or negative (p,p)-current R on $\mathbb{P}^k$, we define the *θ-regularization* R_θ of R by

$$R_\theta := \int_{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{P^k})} (\tau_y)_* R d\mu_\theta(y) = \int_{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{P^k})} (\tau_{\theta y})_* R d\mu(y) = \int_{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{P^k})} (\tau_{\theta y})^* R d\mu(y),$$

where τ_y is the automorphism in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{P^k})$ whose coordinate is y.

Note that the last equality is from the fact that μ is a radial measure and the involution $\tau \to \tau^{-1}$ preserves the norm of y. Observe that if R is positive and closed, then so is R_θ and if $|\theta| = |\theta'|$, then $R_\theta = R_{\theta'}$. The mass of R_θ does not depend on θ (see Lemma 2.4.1 in [7]). The θ-regularization has the following estimate property:

Proposition 4.3 (See Proposition 2.1.6 in [7])**.** *If* $\theta \neq 0$*, then* R_θ *is a smooth form which depends continuously on* R*. Moreover, for every* $\alpha \geq 0$*, there is a constant* c_α *independent of* R *such that*

$$\|R_\theta\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha} \leq c_\alpha \|R\| \, |\theta|^{-2k^2-4k-\alpha} \,.$$

If K *is a compact subset in* $\Delta \setminus \{0\}$*, then there is a constant* $c_{\alpha,K} > 0$ *such that for* $\theta, \theta' \in K$*,*

$$\|R_\theta - R_{\theta'}\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha} \leq c_{\alpha,K} \|R\| \, |\theta - \theta'| \,.$$

The following lemma provides the regularity of the θ-regularization of R in terms of $R \in \mathscr{C}_p$ when R is smooth.

Lemma 4.4 (See Lemma 2.1.8 in [7])**.** *Let* K *be a compact subset of* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{P^k})$*. Let* W *and* W_0 *be open sets in* $\mathbb{P}^k$ *such that* $\overline{W_0} \subset \tau(W)$ *for every* $\tau \in K$*. If* R *is of class* $\mathscr{C}^\alpha$ *on* W *with* $\alpha \geq 0$*, then* $\tau_*(R)$ *is of class* $\mathscr{C}^\alpha$ *on* W_0*. Moreover, there is a constant* $c > 0$ *such that for all* $\tau, \tau' \in K$*,*

$$\|\tau_*(R)\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha(W_0)} \leq c \, \|R\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha(W)}$$

and

$$\|\tau_*(R) - \tau'_*(R)\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha(W_0)} \leq c \, \|R\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha(W)} \, dist(\tau, \tau')^{\min\{\alpha,1\}},$$

where the distance $dist(\cdot,\cdot)$ *is with respect to a fixed smooth metric on* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{P^k})$*.*

Next, we discuss the pullback and push-forward of currents on $\mathbb{P}^k$ by a holomorphic endomorphism $f : \mathbb{P}^k \to \mathbb{P}^k$. Since f is proper, the push-forward of currents is well-defined. On the contrary, in general, the pullback of currents is not well defined; it is defined when f is a submersion on the support of a current. However, Dinh-Sibony proved in [5] that the pullback f^* can be well-defined if we restrict our domain space of currents to positive closed currents. It is not difficult to see that the mass $\|f^*(S)\|$ of $f^*(S)$ is d^p, where d is the degree of the map $f : \mathbb{P}^k \to \mathbb{P}^k$. In [7], they approached to the definition of the pull-back operator f^* in a different way using super-potentials, but the conclusion is essentially same. Hence, the pull-back and push-forward by f on the space of positive closed currents are well-defined. In particular, $\frac{1}{d^p} f^* : \mathscr{C}_p \to \mathscr{C}_p$ is well-defined. We say that a (p, p)-current S is invariant if $\frac{1}{d^p} f^*(S) = S$.

Now, we consider the Green (p, p)-current T^p on $\mathbb{P}^k$. It is a special positive closed (p, p)-current of mass 1 associated with our map f. This is an analogue of the Green current T of bidegree $(1, 1)$. For the details of the Green current T, see [25].

The following is one way to construct T^p. For any holomorphic endomorphism $f : \mathbb{P}^k \to \mathbb{P}^k$, it is known that the sequence $\{d^{-n}(f^n)^*(\omega)\}$ weakly converges to a positive closed $(1, 1)$-current T of mass 1. We call this current T the Green $(1, 1)$-current associated with f. Since T is positive, closed and of bidegree $(1, 1)$, T^p is well-defined for any $1 < p < k$. The Green (p, p)-current is the p-times self-intersection T^p of T. Obviously, T^p is invariant under f, that is, $f^*(T^p) = d^p T^p$.

Another way to construct T^p is using super-potential in [7]. See Theorem 5.3.9 in [7]. The results of the two constructions coincide.

We list some properties of the Green current T (see [25]). The Green current T is positive and closed of mass 1. The current T does not charge any mass on any hypersurfaces. The quasi-potentials of T are Hölder continuous (for example, see Theorem 1.7.1 in [25]). The support of T is the same as the Julia set of f. The Green current T is extremal in the convex compact set of invariant positive closed $(1, 1)$-currents of mass 1. Moreover, equidistribution is well-studied as discussed in Introduction.

Compared to the Green current T, the Green (p, p)-current T^p has the following properties: it is positive and closed; it is invariant under f and it is the extreme point in the convex set of invariant positive closed (p, p)-current for f. It is most diffuse among the invariant currents for f. The super-potential of T^p is Hölder continuous. We are also expecting the equidistribution phenomena. However, as mentioned in Introduction, equidistribution in higher codimensional cases is not as well-known as in one codimensional case. By Theorem 5.3.9 in [7], equidistribution for smooth forms in $\mathscr{C}_p$ is proved. In singular cases, not much is known except Theorem 1.2 (or see Theorem 5.4.4 in [7]).

We close this section by reviewing some class of functions which generalizes the pluri-subharmonic functions.

Definition 4.5 (See [4] and p.12 in [7])**.** An integrable function φ on $\mathbb{P}^k$ is said to be DSH if it is equal outside a pluri-polar set to a difference of two quasi-psh functions.

We identify two DSH functions if they coincide outside a pluripolar set. The set of DSH functions is a vector space over $\mathbb{R}$. The space of DSH functions is endowed with the following norm:

$$\|\varphi\|_{DSH} := \|\varphi\|_{\mathscr{L}^1} + \inf\left\{\left\|T^+\right\| : dd^c\varphi = T^+ - T^-, T^\pm \text{ are positive and closed. }\right\}.$$

The currents T^+ and T^- are cohomologous and have the same mass.

5. Super-potentials

In this section, we briefly introduce the main tool, super-potentials, developed by Dinh-Sibony in [7] to prove Theorem 1.3. For details, see [7].

We first consider the case of bidegree $(1,1)$. For any positive closed $(1,1)$-current S_1 of mass 1 on $\mathbb{P}^k$, a quasi-potential is defined as a solution U_1 to the equation $dd^cU_1 = S_1 - \omega$, where ω is the standard Fubini-Study form. In this case, if we allow $-\infty$, U is a well-defined quasi-plurisubharmonic function with its values in $\mathbb{R}\cup\{-\infty\}$ and is unique up to a constant. Hence, after normalization, the quasi-potential U_1 of S_1 can be uniquely determined. The relationship between a positive closed current and its quasi-potential is very useful in the case of positive closed $(1,1)$-currents; quasi-potentials can be used to define the pull-back of positive closed $(1,1)$-currents and also, to define the wedge-product of positive closed $(1,1)$-currents (for example, see [25]). Moreover, the convergence of a sequence of positive closed $(1,1)$-currents in the current sense can be converted into the convergence of quasi-plurisubharmonic functions in local $\mathscr{L}^1$-sense.

On the other hand, in the case of bidegree (p,p) with $1 < p < k$, for any positive closed (p,p)-current S of mass 1 on $\mathbb{P}^k$, we also have a quasi-potential of S, but the behavior of U is not as good as that of a quasi-potential in the case of $(1,1)$-currents. We have a solution U to the equation $dd^cU = S - \omega^p$, but U is not well defined as a function. Indeed, if U is a quasi-potential of S, then $U + V$ is also a quasi-potential of S for any dd^c-closed current V. In this sense, a quasi-potential U can be very singular. Even after normalization by $\langle U, \omega^{k-p+1}\rangle = 0$, we still do not have a well-defined function; quasi-potentials of S can still differ by dd^c-exact currents.

However, after normalization, the affect of dd^c-exact currents can be resolved by thinking of a quasi-potential U as an action on closed forms or currents of the complementary bidegree, if the action can be well-defined. Recall that if the dd^c-exact currents act on closed forms of complementary bidegree, they always produce 0. So, the action of quasi-potentials becomes unique. The formal definition cannot be understood in this way but the idea of super-potentials seems to work in this way. The following is recapitulated from Introduction in [7]. It explains how we can understand a quasi-potential as an action on the space of probability measures in the case of $(1,1)$-currents. This formulation generalizes to the formal definition of super-potentials.

Recall the equation $dd^cU_1 = S_1 - \omega$ for a $(1,1)$-current $S_1 \in \mathscr{C}_1$. Assume that we choose U_1 satisfying $\langle U_1, \omega^k\rangle = 0$. Let δ_x denote the Dirac mass at x and ν a $(k-1,k-1)$-current such that $\langle \nu, \omega\rangle = 0$ and $dd^c\nu = \delta_x - \omega^k$, which is not necessarily uniquely determined. Then, we have

$$U_1(x) = \langle U_1, \delta_x\rangle = \langle U_1, \delta_x - \omega^k\rangle = \langle U_1, dd^c\nu\rangle = \langle dd^cU_1, \nu\rangle = \langle S - \omega, \nu\rangle = \langle S, \nu\rangle.$$

We can extend the action of U_1 to the convex set of probability measures $\mathscr{C}_k$. Dinh-Sibony introduced the concept of super-potentials in this spirit in [7].

Definition 5.1 (See Section 3 in [7])**.** Assume that S is a smooth form in $\mathscr{C}_p$. Let m be a fixed real number. Then the super-potential of S of mean m is a function on $\mathscr{C}_{k-p+1}$ defined by

$$\mathscr{U}_S(R) := \langle S, U_R\rangle,$$

where R is an element in $\mathscr{C}_{k-p+1}$ and U_R is a quasi-potential of mean m of R.

In general, for $S \in \mathscr{C}_p$, $\mathscr{U}_S(R)$ is defined by

$$\mathscr{U}_S(R) := \lim_{\theta\to 0} \mathscr{U}_{S_\theta}(R)$$

where the subscript means the θ-regularization of S.

Note that if R is smooth, then one can prove that $\mathscr{U}_S(R) = \langle U_S, R\rangle$ where U_S is the quasi-potential of S of mean m (see [7]). Roughly speaking, the prescribed mean m normalizes quasi-potentials of S and the domain space being closed removes the ambiguity caused by the dd^c-exact currents.

The definition of super-potentials does not depend on the choice of a quasi-potential U_R nor U_S if their means equal m. By choosing a canonical type of quasi-potential, we can gain good regularity properties for super-potentials in terms of the current S. Dinh-Sibony introduced the Green quasi-potential.

Theorem 5.2 (See Theorem 2.3.1)**.** *Let R be a current in $\mathscr{C}_p$. Then, there is a negative quasi-potential U of R, depending linearly on R, such that for every r and s with $1 \le r < \frac{k}{k-1}$ and $1 \le s < \frac{2k}{2k-1}$, one has*

$$\|U\|_{\mathscr{L}^r} \le c_r \quad \textit{and} \quad \|dU\|_{\mathscr{L}^s} \le c_s$$

for some positive constants c_r and c_s independent of R. Moreover, U depends continuously on R with respect to $\mathscr{L}^r$ topology on U and the weak topology on R.

Remark 5.3. We call U the *Green quasi-potential* of R. From $\|U\|_{\mathscr{L}^r} \le c_r$ in Theorem 5.2, we know that the mean m of U is bounded by a constant independent of R. Since U is negative, the mass of U is also bounded uniformly with respect to R. $U - m\omega^{p-1}$ is a quasi-potential of mean 0 of R.

The following lemma and proposition precede the proof about the existence of the Green quasi-potential. They are very useful in estimating super-potentials. For the convenience of the reader, we write them here.

Lemma 5.4 (See Lemma 2.3.3 in [7])**.** *There is a negative DSH function η on X smooth outside D such that $\eta - \log dist(\cdot, D)$ is bounded.*

Proposition 5.5 (See Proposition 2.3.2 in [7])**.** *Consider $X := \mathbb{P}^k \times \mathbb{P}^k$ and D the diagonal X. Let $\Omega(z,\xi) := \sum_{j=0}^k \omega(z)^j \wedge \omega(\xi)^{k-j}$, where (z,ξ) denotes the homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbb{P}^k \times \mathbb{P}^k$ with $z = [z_0 : \ldots : z_k]$ and $\xi = [\xi_0 : \ldots : \xi_k]$. Then, there is a negative $(k-1,k-1)$-form K on X smooth outside D such that $dd^cK = [D] - \Omega$ which satisfies the following inequalities near D:*

$$\|K(\cdot)\|_\infty \lesssim -dist(\cdot,D)^{2-2p}\log dist(\cdot,D) \quad \textit{and} \quad \|\nabla K(\cdot)\|_\infty \lesssim dist(\cdot,D)^{1-2p}.$$

Note that $\|\nabla K(\cdot)\|_\infty$ is the sum $\sum_j |\nabla K_j|$, where the K_j's are the coefficients of K for a fixed atlas of X.

Indeed, the Green quasi-potential is defined as follows:

Definition 5.6. The Green quasi-potential U of $R \in \mathscr{C}_p$ is defined by

$$U(z) := \int_{\xi \neq z} R(\xi) \wedge K(z, \xi).$$

Note that U depends on the choice of K.

The super-potentials have some analogous properties to those of quasi-potentials and pluri-subharmonic functions. For details, see Section 3 in [7]. We mention here three of them. The following shows that the super-potentials determine the currents.

Proposition 5.7 (See Proposition 3.1.9 in [7]). *Let I be a compact subset in $\mathbb{P}^k$ with $(2k-2p)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure 0. Let S and S' be currents in $\mathscr{C}_p$, with super-potentials $\mathscr{U}_S$ and $\mathscr{U}_{S'}$. If $\mathscr{U}_S = \mathscr{U}_{S'}$ on smooth forms in $\mathscr{C}_{k-p+1}$ with compact support in $\mathbb{P}^k \setminus I$, then $S = S'$.*

The following is about the compactness property of super-potentials.

Proposition 5.8 (See Proposition 3.2.6 in [7]). *Let $\mathscr{U}_{S_n}$ be a super-potential of a current S_n in $\mathscr{C}_p$. Assume that $\{\mathscr{U}_{s_n}\}_{n \geq 0}$ is bounded from above and does not converge uniformly to $-\infty$. Then there is an increasing sequence $\{n_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ of integers such that S_{n_j} converge to a current S and $\mathscr{U}_{S_{n_j}}$ converge on smooth forms in $\mathscr{C}_{k-p+1}$ to a super-potential $\mathscr{U}_S$ of S. Moreover,*

$$\limsup_{j \to \infty} \mathscr{U}_{s_{n_j}} \leq \mathscr{U}_S.$$

The following theorem is about the regularity of the super-potentials of the Green (p,p)-currents.

Theorem 5.9 (See Theorem 5.4.1 in [7]). *Let $f : \mathbb{P}^k \to \mathbb{P}^k$ be a holomorphic map of algebraic degree ≥ 2. Then, the Green super-potentials of f are Hölder continuous with respect to the distance $dist_1$.*

6. The Proof of the Main Theorem

In this section, we restate Theorem 1.3 in terms of super-potentials using the work of Dinh-Sibony in [7] and prove the new statement (Proposition 6.5). We follow the notations used in Section 5 of [7] for convenience.

Let $S \in \mathscr{C}_p$ be a positive closed (p,p)-current of mass 1. Let T denote the Green $(1,1)$-current associated with f over $\mathbb{P}^k$.

Definition 6.1 (See Section 5 in [7]). The *dynamical super-potential* of S, denoted by $\mathscr{V}_S$, is defined by

$$\mathscr{V}_S := \mathscr{U}_S - \mathscr{U}_{T^p} - c_S,$$

where $\mathscr{U}_S$, $\mathscr{U}_{T^p}$ are the super-potentials of mean 0 of S, T^p, respectively, and $c_S := \mathscr{U}_S(T^{k-p+1}) - \mathscr{U}_{T^p}(T^{k-p+1})$.

Definition 6.2 (See Section 5 in [7]). The *dynamic Green quasi-potential* of S is defined by

$$V_S := U_S - U_{T^p} - (m_S - m_{T^p} + c_S)\omega^{p-1},$$

where U_S, U_{T^p} are the Green quasi-potentials of S, T^p, respectively and m_S, m_{T^p} are their corresponding means.

For notational convenience, we introduce the following notations:

$$L := \frac{1}{d^p} f^* \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda := \frac{1}{d^{p-1}} f_*.$$

The dynamical super-potentials have the following properties.

Lemma 6.3 (See Lemma 5.4.6 in [7])**.** *We have* $\mathscr{V}_S(T^{k-p+1}) = 0$, $\mathscr{V}_S(R) = \langle V_S, R\rangle$ *for smooth* $R \in \mathscr{C}_{k-p+1}$, *and* $\mathscr{V}_{L(S)} = d^{-1}\mathscr{V}_S \circ \Lambda$ *on* $\mathscr{C}_{k-p+1}$. *Moreover,* $\mathscr{U}_S - \mathscr{V}_S$ *is bounded by a constant independent of* S.

Lemma 6.4 (See Lemma 5.4.9 in [7])**.** *Let* V *denote the set of the critical values of* f. *If* R *is smooth, then* $\mathscr{V}_S(\Lambda(R)) = \langle V_S, \Lambda(R)\rangle_{\mathbb{P}^k\setminus V}$.

In Proposition 6.5 we restate Theorem 1.3, in terms of the dynamical super-potentials.

Proposition 6.5. *For any current* $S \in \mathscr{C}_p$ *such that* S *is smooth on* E *and for any smooth form* $R \in \mathscr{C}_{k-p+1}$, *we have*

$$\mathscr{V}_{L^n(S)}(R) \to 0.$$

The convergence is exponentially fast and uniform with respect to S.

The proof of Theorem 1.3. The Proposition 5.8 and Proposition 5.7 prove that Proposition 6.5 implies Theorem 1.3. □

Thus, we prove Proposition 6.5. Before the proof of Proposition 6.5, we note here that it suffices to prove the statement for some iterate of f. We use the work of Dinh in [3] as in Section 2 to find a good iterate of f.

Let $N_f \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $(40k^2 c_\Psi N_f)^{8k} < d^{N_f}$, where c_Ψ is as in Section 2. Then, we can choose $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$(40k^2 c_\Psi N_f)^{\frac{1}{(k+1)N_f}} \cdot d^{\frac{8k(k+1)-1}{8k(k+1)}} < \lambda < d.$$

Consider $E = E_\lambda \cup E'_\lambda$ where $E_\lambda := \left\{\kappa_- \geq \frac{d}{\lambda}\right\}$ and $E'_\lambda := \left\{\iota_- \geq \frac{d}{\lambda}\right\}$ as in Section 2. Then, E is a proper invariant analytic subset for f. Indeed, this E is the desired invariant analytic subset. By Lemma 2.8, there exists $N_E \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, outside E,

(1) the function κ_{-jN_E} is $< \left(\frac{d}{\lambda}\right)^{jN_E}$ and
(2) the multiplicity of the analytic hyper-surface of the critical values of f^{jN_E} is $< c_\Psi jN_E \left(\frac{d}{\lambda}\right)^{jN_E(k+1)}$.

Now, we consider $f^{N_f N_E}$. Let $\delta = c_\Psi jN_E \left(\frac{d}{\lambda}\right)^{jN_E(k+1)}$. Then, from our choice of λ, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}(20k^2(\delta + 1/2))^{8k} < (40k^2\delta)^{8k} \quad &= \quad \left(40k^2 c_\Psi N_f N_E \Big(\frac{d}{\lambda}\Big)^{N_f N_E(k+1)}\right)^{8k} \\ &\leq \quad \left[\left(40k^2 c_\Psi N_f \Big(\frac{d}{\lambda}\Big)^{N_f(k+1)}\right)^{8k}\right]^{N_E} \leq d^{N_f N_E},\end{aligned}$$

and that the local multiplicity of $f^{N_f N_E}$ and the multiplicity of the analytic hyper-surface of the critical values of $f^{N_f N_E}$ are $< \delta$ outside E.

Hence, we replace f by $f^{N_f N_E}$ and d by $d^{N_f N_E}$ and define δ as above. The set E is same. For clarity, the followings are the properties of our new f:

(1) outside the analytic subset E, the maximum of the local multiplicity of f over the preimage of a point under f and the multiplicity of the analytic hyper-surface of the critical values of f are $< \delta$,
(2) the analytic subset E is invariant under f, and
(3) $(20k^2(\delta + 1/2))^{8k} < (40k^2\delta)^{8k} < d$.

The proof of Proposition 6.5. By the hypothesis, we assume that S is smooth over E. Denote by O and O_j connected open neighborhoods of E where S and $L^j(S)$ are smooth, respectively. Let R be a smooth form in $\in \mathscr{C}_{k-p+1}$. Let V denote the set of the critical values of f. Let U_j and V_j denote the Green quasi-potential and the dynamical Green quasi-potential of $L^j(S)$, respectively, for $j = 0, 1, 2, ...$. Let $\{\varepsilon_{n,i}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}, 1\le i\le n}$ be a sequence of positive real numbers, which will be determined after the discussion of Lemma 6.7. Let $R_{n,i}$ be the sequence of positive closed $(k-p+1, k-p+1)$-currents of mass 1 defined by

- $R_{n,0} := R$ and
- $R_{n,i}$ is the $\varepsilon_{n,i}$-regularization of $\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})$.

Then, by Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{V}_{L^n(S)}(R) &= d^{-n}\mathscr{V}_S(\Lambda^n(R))\\
&= d^{-1}\mathscr{V}_{L^{n-1}(S)}(\Lambda(R_{n,0}))\\
&= d^{-1}\langle V_{n-1}, \Lambda(R_{n,0}) - R_{n,1}\rangle_{\mathbb{P}^k\setminus V} + d^{-1}\langle V_{n-1}, R_{n,1}\rangle\\
&= d^{-1}\langle V_{n-1}, \Lambda(R_{n,0}) - R_{n,1}\rangle_{\mathbb{P}^k\setminus V} + d^{-1}\mathscr{V}_{L^{n-1}(S)}(R_{n,1})\\
&\quad \cdots\\
&= d^{-1}\langle V_{n-1}, \Lambda(R_{n,0}) - R_{n,1}\rangle_{\mathbb{P}^k\setminus V} + \cdots\\
&\quad + d^{-i}\langle V_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) - R_{n,i}\rangle_{\mathbb{P}^k\setminus V} + \cdots\\
&\quad + d^{-n}\langle V_0, \Lambda(R_{n,n-1}) - R_{n,n}\rangle_{\mathbb{P}^k\setminus V} + d^{-n}\mathscr{V}_S(R_{n,n}).
\end{aligned}\tag{6.1}$$

For the estimate of $\mathscr{V}_{L^n(S)}(R)$, we compute two types of terms:

(1) $d^{-i}\langle V_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) - R_{n,i}\rangle_{\mathbb{P}^k\setminus V}$ for $1 \le i \le n$ and
(2) $d^{-n}\mathscr{V}_S(R_{n,n})$.

We further consider the terms of the type (1). Note that V_{n-i} is neither positive nor negative in general. Since $\mathscr{C}_p$ has a finite diameter, by Theorem 5.9, we know that T^{k-p+1} has bounded super-potentials. Recall Remark 5.3 and the definition of the dynamical super-potential. Hence, there exists a universal $c > 0$ such that $V'_{n-i} := V_{n-i} + U_{T^p} - c\omega^{p-1}$ is negative in the current sense. It is not difficult to see that $dist_1(\Lambda(R_{n,j-1}), R_{n,j}) \lesssim \varepsilon_{n,j}$. Due to Theorem 5.9 together with $dist_1(\Lambda(R_{n,j-1}), R_{n,j}) \lesssim \varepsilon_{n,j}$ and the constant c in V'_{n-i} being universal, it is enough to compute $d^{-i}\langle V'_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) - R_{n,i}\rangle_{\mathbb{P}^k\setminus V}$ instead of the terms of type (1) for $1 \le i \le n$.

In the estimate of $d^{-i}\langle V'_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) - R_{n,i}\rangle_{\mathbb{P}^k\setminus V}$, we want to divide $\mathbb{P}^k$ into three regions. We first consider Corollary 6.6 from Proposition 3.2 and recall Lemma 6.7.

Corollary 6.6. *There is an integer N_2 and a constant $c_2 \ge 1$ such that if $0 < t < 1$ is a constant and if x, y are two points in $\mathbb{P}^k$ with $dist(x, E) > t$ and $dist(y, E) > t$,* *then we can write*

$$f^{-1}(x)=\left\{x^1,...,x^{d^k}\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad f^{-1}(y)=\left\{y^1,...,y^{d^k}\right\}$$

with $dist(x^i,y^i)\leq c_2t^{-N_2}dist(x,y)^{1/\delta}$.

This corollary is due to the property of f that outside the analytic subset E, the maximum of the local multiplicity of f over the preimage of a point under f is $<\delta$.

Lemma 6.7 (See Lemma 3.1 in [9])**.** *There is a constant* $A_1\geq 1$ *such that for every subsets* X *and* Y *of* $\mathbb{P}^k$*, we have*

$$dist(f^{-j}(X),f^{-j}(Y))\geq {A_1}^{-j}dist(X,Y).$$

In particular, if $f(Y)\subseteq Y$*, we have*

$$dist(f^{-j}(X),Y)\geq {A_1}^{-j}dist(X,Y).$$

In our case, take $X=O^c$ and $Y=E$. Since $O^c_j\subseteq f^{-j}(O^c)$ and $f(E)=E$, we have

$$dist(O^c_j,E)\geq dist(f^{-j}(O^c),E)\geq {A_1}^{-j}dist(O^c,E).$$

Since E is compact, there exists $r>0$ with $dist(O^c,E)>r$. Then, $O^c_j\cap$ the $r{A_1}^{-j}$-neighborhood of $E=\emptyset$. Take $\varepsilon>0$ so that $\varepsilon<\min\left\{c,r,{A_1}^{-1}\right\}^2$ for some fixed sufficiently small $c>0$. We define three sequences $\{s_{n,i}\}$, $\{\varepsilon_{n,i}\}$ and $\{t_{n,i}\}$ of positive real numbers:

- $s_{n,i}=\varepsilon^{ni}$,
- $\varepsilon_{n,i}=\varepsilon^{nC(2+N_2)(40k^2\delta)^{6ki}}$, and
- $t_{n,i}=\varepsilon_{n,i}^{(10k)^{-1}}$,

for $0\leq i\leq n$, where N_2 is the constant in Corollary 6.6 and C is the constant in Lemma 3.4. One can easily see that $s_{n,i}\gg t_{n,i}$. For notational convenience, we introduce some more notations. For $t,s>0$, we express the t-neighborhood of V by V_t and the s-neighborhood of E by E_s. The distance is measured by the standard Fubini-Study metric. Let $W'_{n,i}:=E_{s_{n,i}}$, $W_{n,i}:=V_{t_{n,i}}\setminus W'_{n,i}$, and $W''_{n,i}:=\mathbb{P}^k\setminus(W_{n,i}\cup W'_{n,i})$. From our definitions, $O_{n-i}\cap\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}W'_{n,i}=\emptyset$, where $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}W'_{n,i}$ means $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}s_{n,i}$-neighborhood of E. We split the computation of $\langle V'_{n-i},\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})-R_{n,i}\rangle_{\mathbb{P}^k\setminus V}$ into the following three computations:

- $\langle V'_{n-i},\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})-R_{n,i}\rangle_{W_{n,i}\setminus V}$,
- $\langle V'_{n-i},\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})-R_{n,i}\rangle_{W'_{n,i}\setminus V}$, and
- $\langle V'_{n-i},\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})-R_{n,i}\rangle_{W''_{n,i}}$.

We claim that for sufficiently small $\varepsilon>0$,

(1) $\langle V'_{n-i},\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})-R_{n,i}\rangle_{W_{n,i}\setminus V}\gtrsim-\varepsilon^{ni}$,
(2) $\langle V'_{n-i},\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})-R_{n,i}\rangle_{W'_{n,i}\setminus V}\gtrsim-\varepsilon^{ni}$,
(3) $\langle V'_{n-i},\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})-R_{n,i}\rangle_{W''_{n,i}}\gtrsim-\varepsilon^{ni}$, and
(4) $d^{-n}\mathscr{V}_S(R_{n,n})\gtrsim nd^{-\frac{n}{4}}\log\varepsilon$.

Suppose that our claims are proved. Recall that $\mathscr{V}_{L^n(S)}(R)=d^{-n}\mathscr{V}_S(\Lambda^n(R))$ by Lemma 6.3. Since $\mathscr{V}_S$ is bounded above by a constant independent of S (by Theorem 5.9 and Remark 5.3), we only need to bound $\mathscr{V}_{L^n(S)}(R)$ from below.

For any sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, by Equation 6.1 and our claims (Lemma 7.1, Lemma 8.3, Lemma 9.1 and Lemma 10.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{V}_{L^n(S)}(R) &= d^{-n}\mathscr{V}_S(\Lambda^n(R)) \\ &\gtrsim -d^{-1}\varepsilon^n - d^{-2}\varepsilon^{2n}\cdots - d^{-n}\varepsilon^{n^2} + nd^{-\frac{n}{4}}\log\varepsilon \gtrsim -\varepsilon^n + nd^{-\frac{n}{4}}\log\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Take $\varepsilon = d^{-n}$ for every sufficiently large n and let $n \to \infty$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Hence, it remains to prove our claims. The computations will be completed in Section 7, Section 8, Section 9 and Section 10,.

7. The First Estimate

We consider $\langle V'_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) - R_{n,i}\rangle_{W_{n,i}\setminus V}$. Since V'_{n-i} is negative, we have

$$\langle V'_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) - R_{n,i}\rangle_{W_{n,i}\setminus V} \geq \langle V'_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1})\rangle_{W_{n,i}\setminus V}.$$

Thus, it suffices to prove

Lemma 7.1. *For sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\left|\langle V'_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1})\rangle_{W_{n,i}\setminus V}\right| \lesssim \varepsilon^{ni}.$$

For this lemma, Proposition 7.7 is the major estimate and we need cut-off functions with a tame DSH bound for the estimate. We construct such cut-off functions in Lemma 7.4 using the next two lemmas.

Lemma 7.2 (For example, the θ-regularization of the characteristic function of K)**.** *Let $\theta_0 > 0$ be given and small. We consider $0 < \theta < \theta_0$. Let $K \subset \mathbb{P}^k$ be compact and K_θ a θ-neighborhood of K. The distance is measured with respect to the Fubini-Study metric. Then, there exist smooth cut-off functions $\chi^{K,\theta} : \mathbb{P}^k \to [0,1]$ such that $\chi^{K,\theta} \equiv 1$ over K and supp$(\chi^{K,\theta}) \subset K_\theta$. Moreover, $\left\|\chi^{K,\theta}\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha} \leq c\,|\theta|^{-\alpha}$, where the constant $c > 0$ is independent of θ.*

Lemma 7.3 (See Lemma 2.2.6 in [7])**.** *Let $\chi : \mathbb{R}\cup\{-\infty\} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convex increasing function such that χ' is bounded. Then, for every DSH function φ, $\chi(\varphi)$ is dsh and*

$$\|\chi(\varphi)\|_{DSH} \lesssim 1 + \|\varphi\|_{DSH}.$$

In particular, $\inf\left\|T^-_\chi\right\|$ *is bounded by* $\|\chi'\|_\infty \inf\|T^-\|$*, where $T^\pm_\chi$ and $T^\pm$ are positive closed currents such that $dd^c\chi(\varphi) = T^+_\chi - T^-_\chi$ and $dd^c\varphi = T^+ - T^-$.*

Lemma 7.4. *Assume $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. Let i and n be integers such that $1 \leq i \leq n$. For any $s,t > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{2}(\frac{2}{3})^k s_{n,i} \leq s \leq 2s_{n,i}$ and $\frac{1}{2}t_{n,i} \leq t \leq 2t_{n,i}^{(\delta+1/2)^{-k}}$, there is a family of DSH functions $\chi_{s,t} : \mathbb{P}^k \to \mathbb{R}$ with $0 \leq \chi_{s,t} \leq 1$, such that $\chi_{s,t} \equiv 1$ on $V_t \setminus E_s$, supp$\chi_{s,t} \subseteq V_{t^{(\delta+1/2)^{-1}}} \setminus E_{\frac{2}{3}s}$, and $\|\chi_{s,t}\|_{DSH} \leq c_\chi \max\left\{1, 9s^{-2}\right\}$, where $c_\chi > 0$ is a constant independent of i, n, s, t and ε.*

Proof. We choose a smooth increasing function $\chi : \mathbb{R}\cup\{-\infty\} \to [0,\infty)$ such that $\chi(x) = 0$ on $[-\infty,-1]$ and $\chi(x) = x$ for $x \geq 1$ as in Lemma 7.3. Then, $\max\{x,0\} \leq \chi \leq \max\{x,0\} + 1$. We define:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{s,t} &:= -\chi(\varphi - \log t - A - 1) \\ \tilde{\chi}_{s,t} &:= \chi(\phi_{s,t} + 1) \\ \chi_{s,t} &:= \chi(2(\tilde{\chi}_{s,t} - \chi^{E_{\frac{2}{3}s},\frac{1}{3}s})) - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where $\chi^{E_{\frac{2}{3}s},\frac{1}{3}s}$ is the function in Lemma 7.2 with $K = E_{\frac{2}{3}s}$ and $\theta = \frac{1}{3}s$.

(1) First, we consider $z \in V_t \setminus E_s$. Then, from Lemma 3.4, we have

$$\varphi(z) - \log t - A - 1 \le \log dist(z, V) + A - \log t - A - 1 \le -1$$

So, $\phi_{s,t} = 0$ on $V_t \setminus E_s$. Since the support of $\chi^{E_{\frac{2}{3}s},\frac{1}{3}s}$ is in E_s, we have $\chi_{s,t} = 1$ over $V_t \setminus E_s$.

(2) Second, we consider z outside $V_{t^{(\delta+1/2)^{-1}}} \setminus E_{\frac{2}{3}s}$. Note that if $\tilde{\chi}_{s,t} = 0$ or $\chi^{E_{\frac{2}{3}s},\frac{1}{3}s} = 1$, then $\chi_{s,t} = 0$. For $z \notin V_{t^{(\delta+1/2)^{-1}}} \setminus E_{\frac{2}{3}s}$, from Lemma 3.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi - \log t - A - 1 \\
&\ge \delta \log dist(z, V) + C \log dist(z, E) - A - \log t - A - 1 \\
&\ge -\frac{1}{2\delta + 1} \log(2t_{n,i}^{(\delta+1/2)^{-k}}) + C \log\left(\frac{1}{2}(\frac{2}{3})^k s_{n,i}\right) + C \log \frac{2}{3} - 2A - 1 \\
&\ge -C(40k^2\delta)^{4k} \log\varepsilon - \frac{1}{2\delta + 1} \log 2 + C \log \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{k+1} - 2A - 1 \ge 2
\end{aligned}$$

since ε is sufficiently small. Then, we have $\phi_{s,t} \le -2$ and so $\tilde{\chi}_{s,t} = 0$. Also, since $\chi^{E_{\frac{2}{3}s},\frac{1}{3}s} = 1$ over $E_{\frac{2}{3}s}$, $\chi_{s,t} = 0$ outside $V_{t^{(\delta+1/2)^{-1}}} \setminus E_{\frac{2}{3}s}$.

This proves the support part of the statement.

We check the DSH norm of $\chi_{s,t}$. Since $0 \le \chi_{s,t} \le 1$, the $\mathscr{L}^1$-norm of $\chi_{s,t}$ is uniformly bounded with respect to i, n, s, t and ε. Thus, Lemma 7.3 together with φ being quasi-psh and $\left\|\chi^{E_{\frac{2}{3}s},\frac{1}{3}s}\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^2} \lesssim 9s^{-2}$ prove that the DSH norm is bounded by $c_\chi \max\left\{1, 9s^{-2}\right\}$ for some constant $c_\chi > 0$ independent of i, n, s, t and ε. This completes the proof. ☐

We discuss the Hölder continuity of the quasi-potentials of $f_*(\omega)$ outside E.

Definition 7.5. A continuous map $g : \mathbb{P}^k \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be (H, ν)-Hölder continuous in an open subset $U \subset \mathbb{P}^k$ if any choice of $x, y \in U$ satisfies

$$|g(x) - g(y)| \le H dist(x, y)^\nu.$$

Lemma 7.6. *The quasi-potentials of $f_*(\omega)$ are continuous and in particular, they are $(c_H s^{-N_2}, \delta^{-1})$-Hölder continuous in E_s^c, where $c_H > 0$ is a constant independent of s.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that for a sufficiently small ball neighborhood of a point in $\mathbb{P}^k \setminus E$, there exists a function v with the desired Hölder continuity in E_s^c such that $dd^c v = f_*(\omega)$ over the ball. We may assume $s > 0$ is sufficiently small.

We fix a finite atlas for $\mathbb{P}^k$. Consider an arbitrary point $x \in \mathbb{P}^k$. We denote by $B_x(r_x)$ the ball centered at $x \in \mathbb{P}^k$ and of radius $r_x > 0$. Since f is finite, as $r_x \to 0$, every connected component of $f^{-1}(B_x(r_x))$ tends to a single point. For sufficiently small $r_x > 0$, every connected component of its pre-image belongs to a single chart in the prescribed atlas.

Consider a small ball $B \subset \mathbb{P}^k$. Then, we can think of the following in terms of our fixed finite atlas. Since f is finite, the inverse image $f^{-1}(B)$ of B is a union of small open sets. Then, there is a smooth psh function u on $f^{-1}(B)$ such that

$\omega = dd^c u$ over $f^{-1}(B)$. We define v on B by

$$v(z) := \sum_{w \in f^{-1}(z)} u(w),$$

where the points in $f^{-1}(z)$ are repeated according to their multiplicity. Since f is a finite holomorphic mapping and a priori an open mapping, v is continuous and we can easily deduce $dd^c v = f_*(\omega)$ from the definition of v.

We now prove the Hölder continuity of v in E_s^c. Let $x \in \mathbb{P}^k$ be a point in E_s^c. Consider a ball B_x centered at x and of radius $\frac{s}{2}$. It is enough to consider the case where $dist(x, y) \ll 1$. By Corollary 6.6, we can write, for z and z' in B_x,

$$f^{-1}(z) = \left\{w^1, \cdots, w^{d^k}\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad f^{-1}(z') = \left\{w^{1'}, \cdots, w^{d^k{}'}\right\},$$

so that $dist_{FS}(w^j, w^{j'}) \lesssim s^{-N_2} dist_{FS}(z, z')^{\delta^{-1}}$. Hence,

$$|v(x) - v(y)| \leq m \, \|u\|_{\mathscr{C}^1} \max dist_{FS}(x^i, y^i) \lesssim s^{-N_2} dist_{FS}(x, y)^{\delta^{-1}}.$$

Note we can find a uniform bound of $\|u\|_{\mathscr{C}_1}$ for the fixed finite atlas. This proves the lemma. The constant c_H being independent of s is clear from our argument. □

The following proposition is a modification of Proposition 2.3.6 in [7].

Proposition 7.7. *Assume that $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. Let $s, t > 0$ be such that $\frac{1}{2} s_{n,i} \leq s \leq 2 s_{n,i}$ and $\frac{1}{2} t_{n,i} \leq t \leq 2 t_{n,i}$. Consider $R \in \mathscr{C}_p$ such that $suppR \subseteq E_s^c$. If U is the Green quasi-potential of a current R, then we have the following estimate:*

$$\left| \int_{V_t \setminus (E_s \cup V)} U \wedge \left(\frac{1}{d} f_*(\omega)\right)^{k-p+1} \right| \leq c t^\beta s^{-2-N_2},$$

where N_2 is the constant in Proposition 6.6, $\beta := (20k^2(\delta + 1/2))^{-k} \delta^{-k+p-1}$, and $c > 0$ is a constant independent of ε, s, t, i, n, and R.

Proof. Proposition 7.7 is deduced from Lemma 7.8, Lemma 7.11, Lemma 7.9, and Lemma 7.10. □

In those lemmas, we assume the same hypotheses as in Proposition 7.7.

We use the same notations used in Theorem 2.3.1 and Proposition 2.3.2 in [7]. Consider $M > 0$ and define $\eta_M := \min\{0, M + \eta\}$. Note that $\|\eta_M\|_{DSH}$ is uniformly bounded with respect to M.

We have $\eta_M - M \leq \eta$. Define $K_M := -M\Theta$ and $K'_M := \eta_M \Theta$. Then, K_M is negative closed and we have $K_M + K'_M \lesssim K$. Define also

$$U_M(z) := \int_\xi R(\xi) \wedge K_M(z, \xi) \quad \text{and} \quad U'_M(z) := \int_\xi R(\xi) \wedge K'_M(z, \xi).$$

The form U_M is negative closed and of mass $\simeq M$. $U_M + U'_M \lesssim U$. We choose $M := t^{-\beta}$. We estimate U_M and U'_M separately. Note that U is negative and that Θ has singularities of order $dist(z, \xi)^{2-2k}$.

Since we can apply the proofs of Lemma 2.3.7, Lemma 2.3.9 and Lemma 2.3.10 in [7] in the exactly same way, it suffices to modify Lemma 2.3.8 for our case. For the convenience of the reader, we quote Lemma 2.3.7, Lemma 2.3.9 and Lemma 2.3.10 of [7] below.

Lemma 7.8 (See Lemma 2.3.7 in [7]). *For all sufficiently small $t > 0$, we have*

$$\left| \int_{V_t} U_M \wedge \omega^{k-p+1} \right| \lesssim t$$

Lemma 7.9 (See Lemma 2.3.9 in [7]). *For all sufficiently small $t > 0$, we have $\|U'_M\| \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{2}M}$.*

Note that for sufficiently small $t > 0$, $e^{-\frac{1}{2}(10k^2)^{-l}d^{-kl}M} < e^{-\frac{1}{2}(10k^2)^{-k}d^{-k^2}M} < M^{-1} = t^{\beta}$.

Lemma 7.10. *For every $0 \le l \le k-p+1$, we have*

$$\left| \int U'_M \wedge \Big(\frac{1}{d} f_*(\omega)\Big)^l \wedge \omega^{k-p-l+1} \right| \lesssim s^{-N^2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(10k^2)^{-l}\delta^{-l}M}.$$

We modify Lemma 2.3.8 in [7] as below. By continuity (for example, Corollary in p.147 in [2]), without loss of generality, we may assume that R and U are smooth. We also have that U_M is smooth.

Lemma 7.11. *Let l be such that $0 \le l \le k-p+1$. Then, for any $s, t > 0$ with $\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{2})^{k-p-l+1} s_{n,i} \le s \le 2s_{n,i}$ and $\frac{1}{2}t_{n,i} \le t \le 2(t_{n,i})^{(\frac{1}{\delta+1/2})^{k-p-l+1}}$,*

$$\left| \int_{V_t \setminus (E_s \cup V)} U_M \wedge (\frac{1}{d} f_*(\omega))^l \wedge \omega^{k-p-l+1} \right| \lesssim \Big(\frac{3}{2}\Big)^{(2+N_2)l} t^{\beta_l} s^{-2-N_2},$$

where $\beta_l = (20k^2(\delta+1/2))^{-l}\delta^{-l}$.

Proof. Observe that in our settings, we have $t \ll s$. We use the induction argument on l. The case $l = 0$ follows from Lemma 2.3.7 in [7]. Assume that the lemma is true for $l-1$. Take $\chi_{s,t}$ as in Lemma 7.4. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\int_{V_t \setminus E_s} U_M \wedge (\frac{1}{d} f_*(\omega))^l \wedge \omega^{k-p-l+1} \le -\int \chi_{s,t} U_M \wedge (\frac{1}{d} f_*(\omega))^l \wedge \omega^{k-p-l+1} \\
&= \int -\chi_{s,t} U_M \wedge (\frac{1}{d} f_*(\omega))^{l-1} \wedge \omega^{k-p-l+2} \\
&\qquad\qquad + \int -\chi_{s,t} U_M \wedge (\frac{1}{d} f_*(\omega))^{l-1} \wedge dd^c u \wedge \omega^{k-p-l+1},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\frac{1}{d} f_*(\omega) = \omega + dd^c u$. The bound of the first integral is obtained from the induction hypothesis with the replacement of t by $t^{\frac{1}{\delta+1/2}}$ and s by $\frac{2}{3}s$.

We compute the bound of the second integral. From Lemma 7.6, u is $(c_H s^{-N_2}, \delta^{-1})$-Hölder continuous in E_s^c. By Proposition 4.3 and Lemma 4.4, for an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$, we can find a smooth function u_ε by regularizing u by automorphisms of $\mathbb{P}^k$. The estimate $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{\mathscr{C}^2} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2k^2-4k-2}$ is a direct result of Proposition 4.3. Due to the Hölder continuity of u in E_s^c in Lemma 7.6 and Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\|u - u_\varepsilon\|_\infty \lesssim s^{-N_2} \varepsilon^{\delta^{-1}}.$$

Here, ε will be determined properly later. Then, the second integral can be split as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int -\chi_{s,t}U_M \wedge (\frac{1}{d}f_*(\omega))^{l-1} \wedge dd^c u \wedge \omega^{k-p-l+1}\\&= \int -\chi_{s,t}U_M \wedge (\frac{1}{d}f_*(\omega))^{l-1} \wedge dd^c u_\varepsilon \wedge \omega^{k-p-l+1}\\&\qquad\qquad + \int -(u-u_\varepsilon)dd^c\chi_{s,t} \wedge U_M \wedge (\frac{1}{d}f_*(\omega))^{l-1} \wedge \omega^{k-p-l+1}.\end{aligned}$$

From the $\mathscr{C}^2$-norm of u_ε and the induction hypothesis together with the replacement of t by $t^{\frac{1}{\delta+1/2}}$ and s by $\frac{2}{3}s$, the first integral $\lesssim \varepsilon^{-2k^2-4k-2}\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{(2+N_2)l} t^{\delta^{-1}\beta_{l-1}}s^{-2-N_2}$. The bound of the second integral can be computed cohomologically. From the DSH-norm of $\chi_{s,t}$ and the mass of U_M being of the same order of $M = t^{-\beta}$, we have the second integral $\lesssim s^{-N_2}\varepsilon^{\delta^{-1}}s^{-2}t^{-\beta}$ for the second integral. Take $\varepsilon := t^{\delta^{-1}(2k^2+4k+2+\delta^{-1})^{-1}\beta_{l-1}}$. Then,

$$1 - \frac{2k^2+4k+2}{2k^2+4k+2+\delta^{-1}} \geq \frac{\delta^{-1}}{10k^2}.$$

In result, we have

$$\begin{aligned}t^{\delta^{-1}\beta_{l-1}}\varepsilon^{-2k^2-4k-2} &\lesssim t^{\delta^{-1}\beta_{l-1}(10k^2)^{-1}\delta^{-1}} \lesssim t^{\beta_l}\\ t^{-\beta}\varepsilon^{\delta^{-1}} &\lesssim t^{-\beta}t^{(10k^2\delta)^{-1}\beta_{l-1}\delta^{-1}} \lesssim t^{-\beta}t^{2\beta_l} \lesssim t^{\beta_l}.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the induction and proves the lemma. □

In the same way as in the proof of Lemma 7.11, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 7.12. *Let l be such that $0 \leq l \leq k-p+1$. Then, for any $s, t > 0$ with $\frac{1}{2}(\frac{3}{2})^{k-p-l+1}s_{n,i} \leq s \leq 2s_{n,i}$ and $\frac{1}{2}t_{n,i} \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2}(t_{n,i})^{(\frac{1}{\delta+1/2})^{k-p-l+1}}$,*

$$\left|\int_{V_t\setminus(E_s\cup V)} \omega^{k-l} \wedge (\frac{1}{d}f_*(\omega))^l\right| \lesssim \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{(2+N_2)l} t^{\beta_l}s^{-2-N_2},$$

where $\beta_l = (20k^2(\delta+1/2))^{-l}\delta^{-l}$.

The proof of Lemma 7.1.

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\langle V'_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1})\rangle_{W_{n,i}\setminus V}\right| &\lesssim \|R_{n,i-1}\|_\infty \left|\langle V'_{n-i}, \Lambda(\omega^{k-p+1})\rangle_{W_{n,i}\setminus V}\right|\\ &\lesssim \|R_{n,i-1}\|_\infty \left|\langle V'_{n-i}, \left(\frac{1}{d}f_*(\omega)\right)^{k-p+1}\rangle_{W_{n,i}\setminus V}\right|\\ &\lesssim \varepsilon_{n,i-1}^{-4k^2}t_{n,i}^{\beta}s_{n,i}^{-2-N_2}\\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^{n[C(2+N_2)(40k^2\delta)^{6k(i-1)}(\frac{(40k^2\delta)^{6k}}{10k(40k^2\delta)^k\delta^k}-4k^2)-i]} \lesssim \varepsilon^{ni},\end{aligned}$$

where $C > 1$ is in Lemma 3.4. In the above, the third inequality is from Proposition 4.3, Proposition 7.7, and Lemma 7.12. □

8. The Second Estimate

Assume that $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. Note that $dist(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(x), x) < C_{Aut}\varepsilon_{n,i}$ for $x \in \mathbb{P}^k$ where $dist(\cdot,\cdot)$ is the Standard Fubini-Study metric, y is the coordinate $\|y\|_A < 1$ of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^k)$ centered at the id and $C_{Aut} > 0$ is a constant independent of y, $\varepsilon_{n,i}$ and x.

Recall our notation $\{\varepsilon_{n,i}\}$ in the regularization $R_{n,i}$ of $\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})$. In our settings, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $s_{n,i} \gg \varepsilon_{n,i}$. We define

- $W'_{n,i,0} :=$ the $(s_{n,i} - 3C_{Aut}\varepsilon_{n,i})$-neighborhood of E,
- $W'_{n,i,1} :=$ the $(s_{n,i} - C_{Aut}\varepsilon_{n,i})$-neighborhood of E, and
- $W'_{n,i,2} :=$ the $(s_{n,i} + C_{Aut}\varepsilon_{n,i})$-neighborhood of E.

We consider the currents $\left\{L^{n-i}(S)\right\}$ and their Green quasi-potentials denoted by $\{U_{n-i}\}$ in a neighborhood of the closure of $W'_{n,i,2}$. We will use Proposition 5.5 and the definition of the Green quasi-potential to prove that U_{n-i}'s are smooth over $W'_{n,i,2}$, respectively and to estimate their $\mathscr{C}^1$ norms.

Lemma 8.1. *For sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, for all $i, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \le i \le n$, U_{n-i} is smooth in $W'_{n,i,2}$ and we have*

$$\|U_{n-i}\|_{\mathscr{C}^1(W'_{n,i,2})} \lesssim s_{n,i}^{-2k}(1 + \|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)}(1 + \|S\|_{\infty,E_\varepsilon}).$$

where $\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1}$ is with respect to a fixed finite atlas.

Proof. Note that from our definitions, $L^{n-i}(S)$ is smooth over $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}W'_{n,i}$ since $O_{n-i} \cap \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}W'_{n,i} = \emptyset$. Observe that in this estimate, we do not use the closedness of $L^{n-i}(S)$. Consider a cut-off function $\chi^{E_{\frac{1}{4\sqrt{\varepsilon}}s_{n,i}}, s_{n,i}}$, denoted by χ in this proof, in Lemma 7.2. Write $L^{n-i}(S) = \chi L^{n-i}(S) + (1-\chi)L^{n-i}(S)$. Then, $\chi L^{n-i}(S)$ is a positive smooth (p,p)-form on $\mathbb{P}^k$, $(1-\chi)L^{n-i}(S)$ is a positive (p,p)-current with $supp((1-\chi)L^{n-i}(S)) \cap E_{\frac{1}{4\sqrt{\varepsilon}}s_{n,i}} = \emptyset$ and

$$U_{n-i} = \int_{\xi\neq z}[\chi L^{n-i}(S)](\xi) \wedge K(z,\xi) + \int_{\xi\neq z}[(1-\chi)L^{n-i}(S)](\xi) \wedge K(z,\xi).$$

As in the proof of Lemma 2.3.5 in [7], we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\int_{\xi\neq z}[\chi L^{n-i}(S)](\xi) \wedge K(z,\xi)\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^1}\\ &\le \left\|[\chi L^{n-i}(S)](\xi)\right\|_\infty \cdot \left\|\int_{\xi\neq z}\omega^p(\xi) \wedge K(z,\xi)\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^1} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1}^{p(n-i)}\|S\|_{\infty,E_\varepsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

We consider the other part: $\int_{\xi\neq z}[(1-\chi)L^{n-i}(S)](\xi) \wedge K(z,\xi)$. For notational convenience, we denote $(1-\chi)L^{n-i}(S)$ by S_{n-i} in the rest of the proof. From our settings, we have that $dist(E, supp(S_{n-i})) \ge \frac{1}{4\sqrt{\varepsilon}}s_{n,i}$. So, consider $z \in W'_{n,i,2}$. Then, $dist(z, O^c_{n-i}) \ge (\frac{1}{4\sqrt{\varepsilon}} - 1 - C_{Aut})s_{n,i}$, and

$$\int_{\xi\neq z} S_{n-i}(\xi) \wedge K(z,\xi) = \int_{\xi\notin B_z((\frac{1}{4\sqrt{\varepsilon}}-1-C_{Aut})s_{n,i})} S_{n-i}(\xi) \wedge K(z,\xi), \tag{8.1}$$

where $B_z((\frac{1}{4\sqrt{\varepsilon}} - 1 - C_{Aut})s_{n,i})$ is the ball centered at z and of radius $(\frac{1}{4\sqrt{\varepsilon}} - 1 - C_{Aut})s_{n,i}$. For each $\xi \notin B_z((\frac{1}{4\sqrt{\varepsilon}} - 1 - C_{Aut})s_{n,i})$, $K(z,\xi)$ is smooth. Hence, $\int_{\xi\neq z} S_{n-i}(\xi) \wedge K(z,\xi)$ is smooth.

We estimate the $\mathscr{C}_1$-norm of $\int_{\xi\neq z} S_{n-i}(\xi)\wedge K(z,\xi)$ in $W'_{n,i,2}$. Since ∇K has singularities of order $(z-\xi)^{1-2k}$ from Proposition 5.5 and the mass of S_{n-i} is bounded by the mass of $L^{n-i}(S)$, which equals 1, we have

$$\left\|\int_{\xi\neq z} S_{n-i}(\xi)\wedge K(z,\xi)\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^1} \lesssim \left(\left(\frac{1}{4\sqrt{\varepsilon}}-1-C_{Aut}\right)s_{n,i}\right)^{1-2k} \leq s_{n,i}^{-2k},$$

from Equality 8.1. This inequality implies the lemma. □

Now, we estimate $\langle V'_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1})-R_{n,i}\rangle_{W'_{n,i}\setminus V}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle V'_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1})-R_{n,i}\rangle_{W'_{n,i}\setminus V} &= \langle V'_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1})-R_{n,i}\rangle_{W'_{n,i}}\\ = \int_{W'_{n,i}} V'_{n-i}\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) &- \int_{W'_{n,i}}\int_{\{\|y\|_A<1\}} V'_{n-i}\wedge(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})^*\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})d\mu(y).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})$ has $\mathscr{L}^1$-coefficients, we use Fubini's theorem:

$$= \int_{W'_{n,i}} V'_{n-i}\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) - \int_{\{\|y\|_A<1\}}\int_{W'_{n,i}} V'_{n-i}\wedge(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})^*\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})d\mu(y).$$

Since each $\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}$ is an automorphism, by use of change of coordinates, we have

$$= \int_{W'_{n,i}} V'_{n-i}\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) - \int_{\{\|y\|_A<1\}}\int_{\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i})} (\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})_*(V'_{n-i})\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})d\mu(y).$$

Observe that due to our choice of C_{Aut}, we have $W'_{n,i,1}\subseteq W'_{n,i}$ and $W'_{n,i,1}\subseteq \tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i})$ for all y with $\|y\|_A<1$. Then, the last integral can be written as the following sum:

$$\int_{W'_{n,i,1}} V'_{n-i}\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) - \int_{\{\|y\|_A<1\}}\int_{W'_{n,i,1}} (\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})_*(V'_{n-i})\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})d\mu(y) \tag{8.2}$$

$$+\int_{W'_{n,i}\setminus W'_{n,i,1}} V'_{n-i}\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) \tag{8.3}$$

$$-\int_{\{\|y\|_A<1\}}\int_{\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i})\setminus W'_{n,i,1}} (\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})_*(V'_{n-i})\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})d\mu(y). \tag{8.4}$$

The Computation of 8.2. From Lemma 8.1, V'_{n-i} is smooth over $W'_{n,i}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}|\ 8.2| &= \left|\int_{\{\|y\|_A<1\}}\int_{W'_{n,i,1}} (V'_{n-i}-(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})_*(V'_{n-i}))\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})d\mu(y)\right|\\ &\leq \left\|V'_{n-i}-(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})_*(V'_{n-i})\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^0(W'_{n,i,1})}\int_{\{\|y\|_A<1\}}\int_{W'_{n,i,1}}\omega^{p-1}\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})d\mu(y)\\ &\lesssim C_{Aut}\left\|V'_{n-i}\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^1(W'_{n,i,1})}\varepsilon_{n,i}\int_{\{\|y\|_A<1\}}\int_{W'_{n,i,1}}\omega^{p-1}\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})d\mu(y)\\ &\lesssim C_{Aut}\left\|V'_{n-i}\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^1(W'_{n,i,1})}\varepsilon_{n,i}\cdot\text{the mass of }\Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) = C_{Aut}\left\|V'_{n-i}\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^1(W'_{n,i,1})}\varepsilon_{n,i},\end{aligned}$$

where C_{Aut} is the constant in the beginning of this section. Since c_{n-i} in the definition of V'_{n-i} is uniformly bounded and ω is smooth, from Lemma 8.1,

$$\left\|V'_{n-i}\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^1(W'_{n,i,1})} \lesssim (s_{n,i})^{-2k}(1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)}.$$

Thus, we have

$$|\ 8.2| \lesssim s_{n,i}^{-2k}(1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)}\varepsilon_{n,i}.$$

The Computation of 8.3. We split the integral into two integrals as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{W'_{n,i}\setminus W'_{n,i,1}} V'_{n-i}\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})\\ &=\int_{(W'_{n,i}\setminus W'_{n,i,1})\cap V_{t_{n,i}}} V'_{n-i}\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})+\int_{(W'_{n,i}\setminus W'_{n,i,1})\setminus V_{t_{n,i}}} V'_{n-i}\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1}).\end{aligned}$$

We consider the first integral. Since V'_{n-i} is negative and $\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})$ is positive, we have

$$\begin{aligned}0&\geq\int_{(W'_{n,i}\setminus W'_{n,i,1})\cap V_{t_{n,i}}} V'_{n-i}\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})\geq\int_{V_{t_{n,i}}\setminus W'_{i,1}} V'_{n-i}\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})\\ &=\int_{V_{t_{n,i}}\setminus W'_{i,1}} U_{n-i}\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})-\int_{V_{t_{n,i}}\setminus W'_{i,1}} c_{n-i}\omega^{k-p}\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Since $f_*(\omega^p)\leq(f_*(\omega))^p$ in the current sense, the last integral is bounded by the following:

$$\begin{aligned}&\gtrsim\|R_{n,i-1}\|_\infty\int_{V_{t_{n,i}}\setminus W'_{i,1}} U_{n-i}\wedge\Lambda(\omega^p)-\|R_{n,i-1}\|_\infty\int_{V_{t_{n,i}}\setminus W'_{i,1}} c_{n-i}\omega^{k-p}\wedge\Lambda(\omega^p)\\ &\gtrsim\|R_{n,i-1}\|_\infty\int_{V_{t_{n,i}}\setminus W'_{i,1}} U_{n-i}\wedge(\frac{1}{d}f_*(\omega))^p\\ &\qquad\qquad-\|R_{n,i-1}\|_\infty\int_{V_{t_{n,i}}\setminus W'_{i,1}} c_{n-i}\omega^{k-p}\wedge(\frac{1}{d}f_*(\omega))^p\\ &\gtrsim-\|R_{n,i-1}\|_\infty t_{n,i}^{\beta}s_{n,i}^{-2-N_2}\gtrsim-\varepsilon_{n,i-1}^{-4k^2}t_{n,i}^{\beta}s_{n,i}^{-2-N_2}.\end{aligned}$$

The second last inequality is due to Proposition 7.7 and Lemma 7.12 and the estimate of $\|R_{n,i-1}\|_\infty$ in the last inequality is from Proposition 4.3.

We estimate the second integral.

Lemma 8.2. *For all sufficiently small $t>0$, we have*

$$\|\Lambda(R)\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha(V_t^c)}\lesssim\|R\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha}t^{-(4+\alpha)k},$$

for any smooth form R of bidegree (p,p) with $0\leq p\leq k$. The coefficient in the inequality is independent of t and R.

Proof. First, we fix a finite atlas for $\mathbb{P}^k$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $t>0$ are sufficiently small Consider $a\in V_t^c$. We denote by $B_{t/2}$ the ball centered at $a\in V_t^c$ and of radius $t/2$. Then, there exist d^k injective holomorphic maps $g_j:B_{t/2}\to\mathbb{P}^k$ such that $f\circ g_j=id$ on $B_{t/2}$. Such g_j's are uniformly bounded by a uniform constant. In particular, the constant is independent of t and a. From the Cauchy-integral formula, we know that all the derivatives of order n of g_j on $B_{t/4}$ are $\lesssim t^{-n}$. On $B_{t/2}$, we have

$$\Lambda(R)=d^{-p+1}\sum_{j=1}^{d^k}g_j^*(R).$$

For fixed local real coordinates $(x_1, ..., x_{2k})$, R is a combination with smooth coefficients of $dx_{j_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_{j_{2k-2p+2}}$. Hence, the estimate on the derivatives of g_j implies that

$$\left\|g_j^*(R)\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha(B_{t/4})} \lesssim \|R\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha}\, t^{-2k+2p-2-\alpha} \lesssim \|R\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha}\, t^{-(4+\alpha)k}.$$

It follows that

$$\|\Lambda(R)\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha(V^c_{(3/4)t})} \lesssim \|R\|_{\mathscr{C}^\alpha}\, t^{-(4+\alpha)k}.$$

This implies the lemma. □

Since $(W'_{n,i} \setminus W'_{n,i,1}) \setminus V_{t_{n,i}} \subset W'_{n,i} \cap V^c_{t_{n,i}}$, from Lemma 8.1 and Lemma 8.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{(W'_{n,i} \setminus W'_{n,i,1}) \setminus V_{t_{n,i}}} V'_{n-i} \wedge \Lambda(R_{n,i-1})\right| \\
&\leq \left\|V'_{n-i}\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^0(W'_{n,i})} \|\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})\|_{\mathscr{C}^0(V^c_{t_{n,i}})} \cdot \text{ the volume of } (W'_{n,i} \setminus W'_{n,i,1}) \setminus V_{t_{n,i}} \\
&\lesssim s_{n,i}^{-2k}(1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)} \varepsilon_{n,i-1}^{-4k^2} t_{n,i}^{-4k} \varepsilon_{n,i}
\end{aligned}$$

From the estimates of the first and the second integral, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\ 8.3| \quad &\lesssim \quad \max\left\{\varepsilon_{n,i-1}^{-4k^2} t_{n,i}^{\beta} s_{n,i}^{-2-N_2},\, s_{n,i}^{-2k}(1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)} \varepsilon_{n,i-1}^{-4k^2} t_{n,i}^{-4k} \varepsilon_{n,i}\right\} \\
&\leq \quad s_{n,i}^{-2k(2+N_2)}(1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)} \varepsilon_{n,i-1}^{-4k^2} t_{n,i}^{\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

The Computation of 8.4. We consider

$$\int_{\left\{\|y\|_A<1\right\}} \int_{\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i}) \setminus W'_{n,i,1}} (\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})_*(V'_{n-i}) \wedge \Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) d\mu(y).$$

As in the computation of 8.3, we split the integral into two parts:

$$\begin{aligned}
= &\int_{\left\{\|y\|_A<1\right\}} \int_{(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i}) \setminus W'_{n,i,1}) \cap V_{t_{n,i}}} (\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})_*(V'_{n-i}) \wedge \Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) d\mu(y) \\
&+ \int_{\left\{\|y\|_A<1\right\}} \int_{(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i}) \setminus W'_{n,i,1}) \setminus V_{t_{n,i}}} (\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})_*(V'_{n-i}) \wedge \Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) d\mu(y).
\end{aligned}$$

We compute the second integral first. Note that V'_{n-i} is negative and $\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})$ is positive. From Lemma 4.4 together with V'_{n-i} being smooth, the second integral is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{\left\{\|y\|_A<1\right\}} \int_{(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i}) \setminus W'_{n,i,1}) \setminus V_{t_{n,i}}} (\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})_*(V'_{n-i}) \wedge \Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) d\mu(y)\right| \\
&\lesssim \int_{\left\{\|y\|_A<1\right\}} \left\|(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})_*(V'_{n-i})\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^0(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i}))} \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot \int_{(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i}) \setminus W'_{n,i,1}) \setminus V_{t_{n,i}}} \omega^{k-p} \wedge \Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) d\mu(y) \\
&\lesssim \left\|V'_{n-i}\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^0(W'_{n,i,2})} \|\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})\|_{\mathscr{C}^0(V^c_{t_{n,i}})} \cdot \text{ the volume of } (W'_{n,i,2} \setminus W'_{n,i,1}) \setminus V_{t_{n,i}} \\
&\lesssim s_{n,i}^{-2k}(1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)} \varepsilon_{n,i-1}^{-4k^2} t_{n,i}^{-4k} \varepsilon_{n,i}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the second last inequality, we have $\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i}) \subseteq W'_{n,i,2}$ for all y with $\|y\|_A < 1$; in the last inequality, the bound of $\|\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})\|_{\mathscr{C}^0(V^c_{t_{n,i}})}$ is from Lemma 8.1 and $\left\|V'_{n-i}\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^0(W'_{n,i,2})}$ can be computed in the same way as in Lemma 8.1.

We compute the first integral. Concerning the first integral, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{\|y\|_A<1}\int_{(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i})\backslash W'_{n,i,1})\cap V_{t_{n,i}}}(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})_*(V'_{n-i})\wedge\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})d\mu(y)\right|\\
&\le \left\|(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})_*(V'_{n-i})\right\|_{\infty(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i}))}\|R_{n,i-1}\|_\infty\\
&\qquad\qquad\cdot\int_{\|y\|_A<1}\int_{(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i})\backslash W'_{n,i,1})\cap V_{t_{n,i}}}\omega^{k-p}\wedge\Lambda(\omega^p)d\mu(y)\\
&\lesssim \left\|(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})_*(V'_{n-i})\right\|_{\infty(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i}))}\|R_{n,i-1}\|_\infty\\
&\qquad\qquad\cdot\int_{\|y\|_A<1}\int_{(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i})\backslash W'_{n,i,1})\cap V_{t_{n,i}}}\omega^{k-p}\wedge(\frac{1}{d}f_*(\omega))^p d\mu(y).
\end{aligned}$$

The last integral is due to $f_*(\omega^p)\le(f_*(\omega))^p$ in the current sense. By Lemma 4.4, we have the above integral is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \left\|V'_{n-i}\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^0(W'_{n,i,2})}\|R_{n,i-1}\|_\infty\\
&\qquad\qquad\cdot\int_{\|y\|_A<1}\int_{(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}(W'_{n,i})\backslash W'_{n,i,1})\cap V_{t_{n,i}}}\omega^{k-p}\wedge(\frac{1}{d}f_*(\omega))^p d\mu(y)\\
&\lesssim \left\|V'_{n-i}\right\|_{\mathscr{C}^0(W'_{n,i,2})}\|R_{n,i-1}\|_\infty\int_{V_{t_{n,i}}\backslash W'_{n,i,1}}\omega^{k-p}\wedge(\frac{1}{d}f_*(\omega))^p\\
&\lesssim s^{-2k}_{n,i}(1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)}\varepsilon^{-4k^2}_{n,i-1}t^\beta_{n,i}s^{-2-N_2}_{n,i}.
\end{aligned}$$

The second last inequality follows from the positivity of the integrand; the last inequality is due to Proposition 4.3, Lemma 7.12 and Lemma 8.1.

From the first and the second integral, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\ 8.4| \quad &\lesssim \quad \max\{s^{-2k}_{n,i}(1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)}\varepsilon^{-4k^2}_{n,i-1}t^\beta_{n,i}s^{-2-N_2}_{n,i},\\
&\qquad\qquad s^{-2k}_{n,i}(1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)}\varepsilon^{-4k^2}_{n,i-1}t^{-4k}_{n,i}\varepsilon_{n,i}\}\\
&\le \quad s^{-2k(2+N_2)}_{n,i}(1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)}\varepsilon^{-4k^2}_{n,i-1}t^\beta_{n,i}.
\end{aligned}$$

From the computations of 8.2, 8.3, and 8.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\langle V'_{n-i},\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})-R_{n,i}\rangle_{W'_{n,i}\backslash V}\right|\\
&\lesssim \max\left\{s^{-2k}_{n,i}(1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)}\varepsilon_{n,i}, s^{-2p(2+N_2)}_{n,i}(1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)}\varepsilon^{-4k^2}_{n,i-1}t^\beta_{n,i}\right\}\\
&\le s^{-2k(2+N_2)}_{n,i}(1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)}\varepsilon^{-4k^2}_{n,i-1}t^\beta_{n,i}\\
&\le (1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)}\varepsilon^{-2nik(2+N_2)}\varepsilon^{-4k^2nC(2+N_2)(40k^2\delta)^{6k(i-1)}}\varepsilon^{nC(2+N_2)\frac{(40k^2\delta)^{6ki}}{10k(40k^2\delta^2)^k}}\\
&\le (1+\|f\|_{\mathscr{C}^1})^{p(n-i)}\varepsilon^{n(2+N_2)[C(40k^2\delta)^{6k(i-1)}(\frac{(40k^2\delta)^{6k}}{10k(40k^2\delta)^k\delta^k}-4k^2)-2ik]}\le\varepsilon^{ni}
\end{aligned}$$

since ε is sufficiently small.

We have just proved the following:

Lemma 8.3. *For sufficiently small* $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\left|\langle V'_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) - R_{n,i}\rangle_{W'_{n,i}\setminus V}\right| \lesssim \varepsilon^{ni}$$

9. The Third Estimate

We estimate $\langle V_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) - R_{n,i}\rangle_{W''_{n,i}}$ in the same way as in Lemma 5.4.7 in [7].

Lemma 9.1. *For sufficiently small* $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\left|\langle V'_{n-i}, \Lambda(R_{n,i-1}) - R_{n,i}\rangle_{W''_i}\right| \lesssim t_{n,i}^{-5k}\varepsilon_{n,i}\varepsilon_{n,i-1}^{-5k^2} = \varepsilon_{n,i}^{\frac{1}{2}}\varepsilon_{n,i-1}^{-5k^2} \leq \varepsilon^{ni}$$

Proof. Recall the constant $C_{Aut} > 0$ in the beginning of Section 8. Shrink if necessary and assume that $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough that $C_{Aut}\varepsilon_{n,i} < \frac{1}{2}t_{n,i}$. Let $\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y}$ be an automorphism in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{k}})$ such that $\|y\|_A < 1$. With Lemma 8.2 for $\alpha = 1$ and Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|(\tau_{\varepsilon_{n,i}y})_*(\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})) - \Lambda(R_{n,i-1})\right\|_{\infty,W''_{n,i}} &\lesssim \|\Lambda(R_{n,i-1})\|_{\mathscr{C}^1(V^c_{t_{n,i}/2})}\, dist(\tau, id)\\ &\leq \|R_{n,i-1}\|_{\mathscr{C}^1}\, t_{n,i}^{-5k}\varepsilon_{n,i}.\end{aligned}$$

From the Proposition 4.3, $\|R_{n,i-1}\|_{\mathscr{C}^1} \lesssim \varepsilon_{n,i-1}^{-2k^2-4k-1} \lesssim \varepsilon_{n,i-1}^{-5k^2}$. Since V'_{n-i} is negative and V'_{n-i} has a bounded mass independent of i, we are done. □

10. The Fourth Estimate

For the estimate of $d^{-n}\mathscr{V}_S(R_{n,n})$, we use the following proposition proved in [7].

Proposition 10.1 (See Lemma 3.2.10 in [7])**.** *Let* $W \subset \mathbb{P}^k$ *be an open subset and* $K \subset W$ *be a compact set. Let* S *be a positive closed* (p,p)*-current of mass* 1 *with support in* K *and* R *be a current in* $\mathscr{C}_{k-p+1}$*. Assume that the restriction of* R *to* W *is a bounded form. Then the super-potential* $\mathscr{U}_S$ *of mean* 0 *of* S *satisfies*

$$|\mathscr{U}_S(R)| \leq c(1 + \log^+ \|R\|_{\infty,W}),$$

where $c > 0$ *is a constant independent of* S *and* R*, and* $\log^+ := \max\{\log, 0\}$.

From Proposition 10.1, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 10.2. *For sufficiently small* $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$d^{-n}\,|\mathscr{V}_S(R_{n,n})| \lesssim nd^{-\frac{n}{4}}(-\log\varepsilon).$$

Proof. From Proposition 4.3, we have $\|R_{n,n}\|_\infty \lesssim \varepsilon_{n,n}^{-4k^2}$. We apply Proposition 10.1 to $W = K = \mathbb{P}^k$, $\mathscr{U} = \mathscr{V}_S$ and $R = R_{n,n}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}d^{-n}\,|\mathscr{V}_S(R_{n,n})| &\lesssim d^{-n}\log\varepsilon_{n,n}^{-4k^2}\\ &= d^{-n}\cdot[nC(2+N_2)(40k^2\delta)^{6kn}]\cdot 4k^2\cdot(-\log\varepsilon) \lesssim nd^{-\frac{n}{4}}(-\log\varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is from our assumption on δ in Section 6. This proves the lemma. □

11. Examples

The following example is a case where Theorem 1.3 is applicable but Theorem 1.2 is not. We use a map considered by Fornæss and Sibony in [13].

Example 11.1. Consider a holomorphic endmorphism $F : \mathbb{P}^5 \to \mathbb{P}^5$ defined by

$$F([z : w : t : \alpha : \beta : \gamma]) \to [(z-2w)^2 : z^2 : (z-2t)^2 : (\alpha-2\beta)^2 : \alpha^2 : (\alpha-2\gamma)^2].$$

The critical set $\mathscr{C}_F$ of the map F is $\{z = 2w\} \cup \{z = 0\} \cup \{z = 2t\} \cup \{\alpha = 2\beta\} \cup \{\alpha = 0\} \cup \{\alpha = 2\gamma\}$. This map is a post-critical map. Let $\mathscr{P}_F$ denote the post-critical set. We have the following orbits of the set of critical points of F:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\{z = 0\} \to \{w = 0\} \to \{z = w\} \circlearrowleft \\
&\{z = 2w\} \to \{z = 0\} \to \{w = 0\} \to \{z = w\} \circlearrowleft \\
&\{z = 2t\} \to \{t = 0\} \to \{w = t\} \rightleftarrows \{z = t\} \\
&\{\alpha = 0\} \to \{\beta = 0\} \to \{\alpha = \beta\} \circlearrowleft \\
&\{\alpha = 2\beta\} \to \{\alpha = 0\} \to \{\beta = 0\} \to \{\alpha = \beta\} \circlearrowleft \\
&\{\alpha = 2\gamma\} \to \{\gamma = 0\} \to \{\beta = \gamma\} \rightleftarrows \{\alpha = \gamma\}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathscr{P}_F = \mathscr{C}_F \cup \{w = 0\} \cup \{t = 0\} \cup \{z = w\} \cup \{w = t\} \cup \{z = t\} \cup \{\beta = 0\} \cup \{\gamma = 0\} \cup \{\alpha = \beta\} \cup \{\beta = \gamma\} \cup \{\alpha = \gamma\}$ is a finite union of projective linear subspaces. We first consider κ'_-. We claim that $\kappa'_- \equiv 1$ and the set E'_μ is empty. The chain rule proves that the set of critical set of F^n is $\cup_{i=0}^{n-1} F^{-i}(\mathscr{C}_F)$ and therefore, the set of the critical values of F^n is $\cup_{i=1}^{n} F^i(\mathscr{C}_F) \subseteq \mathscr{P}_F$, which is bounded with respect to inclusion independently of $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies our claim.

Hence, we only consider E_λ. We explicitly compute κ_- for F. Note that $\{[0 : 0 : t : 0 : 0 : \gamma]\}$ is a complete invariant projective linear subspace for F. Therefore the multiplicity of F^n at each point of $\{[0 : 0 : t : 0 : 0 : \gamma]\}$ is 16^n, which means $\kappa_- = 16$ for the set.

Next, we claim that the forward orbit of each point outside $\{z = 0, w = 0\} \cup \{\alpha = 0, \beta = 0\}$ can visit $\mathscr{C}_F$ at most 4 times. Observe that $\{z = 2w\}$ and $\{\alpha = 2\beta\}$ maps into $\{z = 0\}$ and $\{\alpha = 0\}$ under F, respectively. After the first visit to $\{z = 0\} \cup \{z = 2t\} \cup \{\alpha = 0\} \cup \{\alpha = 2\gamma\}$ in $\mathscr{C}_F$, the second visit to $\mathscr{C}_F$ should take place on the intersection of $\mathscr{C}_F$ and $\{w = 0\} \cup \{t = 0\} \cup \{z = w\} \cup \{w = t\} \cup \{z = t\} \cup \{\beta = 0\} \cup \{\gamma = 0\} \cup \{\alpha = \beta\} \cup \{\beta = \gamma\} \cup \{\alpha = \gamma\}$. After the second visit to $\mathscr{C}_F$, the images of those intersection points afterwards are completely determined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\{z = w = 0\} \circlearrowleft \\
&\{z = t = 0\} \to \{w = t = 0\} \to \{z = w = t\} \circlearrowleft \\
&\{z = 0, w = t\} \to \{z = t, w = 0\} \to \{z = w = t\} \circlearrowleft \\
&\{z = 2w, t = 0\} \to \{z = 0, w = t\} \to \{z = t, w = 0\} \to \{z = w = t\} \circlearrowleft \\
&\{z = 2w = 2t\} \to \{z = t = 0\} \to \{w = t = 0\} \to \{z = w = t\} \circlearrowleft \\
&\{z = 2w = t\} \to \{z = 0, w = t\} \to \{z = t, w = 0\} \to \{z = w = t\} \circlearrowleft \\
&\{z = 2t, w = 0\} \to \{z = w = 4t\} \circlearrowleft \\
&\{z = w = 2t\} \to \{z = w, t = 0\} \to \{z = w = t\} \circlearrowleft
\end{aligned}$$

and the same is true when z, w, t are replaced by α, β, γ. These cases prove our claim. Therefore, the multiplicity of F^n at a point outside $\{z = 0, w = 0\} \cup$

$\{\alpha = 0, \beta = 0\}$ is uniformly bounded with respect to the choice of the point and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies that $\kappa_- = 1$ for those points. In the same way, we obtain $\kappa_- = 4$ for the remaining case. Summarizing it, we have

$$\kappa_- = \begin{cases} 16 \text{ for } \{[0:0:t:0:0:\gamma]\} \\ 4 \text{ for } [\{z=0, w=0\} \cup \{\alpha=0, \beta=0\}] \setminus \{z=w=\alpha=\beta=0\} \\ 1 \text{ elsewhere.} \end{cases}$$

It is not too difficult to see that $E = \{z = 0, w = 0\} \cup \{\alpha = 0, \beta = 0\}$. Consider the current of integration over the projective linear subspace defined by $\{z = w = 3t, \alpha = \beta = 3\gamma\}$. We normalize it by its mass and call the normalized one S. Note that S is a positive closed $(4,4)$-current. Theorem 1.3 is applicable to S in order to verify the convergence towards T^4. However, on E, the hypothesis of Lemma 5.4.5 in [7] is violated. Indeed, it is clear that there is no $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(20 \cdot 5^2 4^N)^{8\cdot 5} < 32^N$. Thus, we cannot use Theorem 1.2 to S.

References

[1] Hans Brolin. Invariant sets under iteration of rational functions. *Ark. Mat.*, 6:103–144, 1965.

[2] Jean-Pierre Demailly. Complex analytic geometry. available at www.fourier.ujf-grenoble.fr/∼demailly.

[3] Tien-Cuong Dinh. Analytic multiplicative cocycles over holomorphic dynamical systems. *Complex Var. Elliptic Equ.*, 54:243–251, 2009.

[4] Tien-Cuong Dinh and Nessim Sibony. Distribution des valeurs de transformations méromorphes et applications. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 81:221–258, 2006.

[5] Tien-Cuong Dinh and Nessim Sibony. Pull-back of currents by holomorphic maps. *Manuscripta Math.*, 123:357–371, 2007.

[6] Tien-Cuong Dinh and Nessim Sibony. Equidistribution towards the green current for holomorphic maps. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.*, 41:307–336, 2008.

[7] Tien-Cuong Dinh and Nessim Sibony. Super-potentials of currents, intersection theory and dynamics. *Acta Math.*, 203:1–82, 2009.

[8] Tien-Cuong Dinh and Nessim Sibony. Dynamics in several complex variables: Endomorphisms of projective spaces and polynomial-like mappings. In *Holomorphic Dynamical Systems, Cetraro, Italy, July 7-12, 2008*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, pages 165–294. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2010.

[9] Tien-Cuong Dinh and Nessim Sibony. Equidistribution speed for endomorphisms of projective spaces. *Math. Ann.*, 347:613–626, 2010.

[10] Charles Favre. Note on pull-back and lelong number of currents. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 127(3):445–458, 1999.

[11] Charles Favre and Mattias Jonsson. Brolin's theorem for curves in two complex dimensions. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 53(5):1461–1501, 2003.

[12] Herbert Federer. *Geometric Measure Theory.* Springer-Verlag New York Inc., 1969.

[13] John Erik Fornæss and Nessim Sibony. Critically finite rational maps on $\mathbb{P}^2$. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 137:245–260, 1992.

[14] John Erik Fornæss and Nessim Sibony. Complx dynamics in higher dimensions. In *Complex potential theory (Montreal, PQ, 1993)*, volume 439, pages 131–186. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1994.

[15] John Erik Fornæss and Nessim Sibony. Complex dynamics in higher dimension II. In *Modern methods in complex analysis (Princeton, NJ, 1992)*, volume 137 of *Ann. Math. Stud.*, pages 135–182. Princeton University Press, 1995.

[16] Alexandre Freire, Artur Lopes, and Ricardo Mañé. An invariant measure for rational maps. *Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat.*, 14(1):45–62, .

[17] Vincent Guedj. Equidistribution towards the green current. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 131(3):359–372, 2003.

[18] Robert C. Gunning. *Lectures on Complex Analytic Varieties: the Local Parametrization Theorem.* Preliminary Informal Notes of University Courses and Seminars in Mathematics. Princeton University Press, 1970.

[19] Pierre Lelong. *Fonctions Plurisousharmoniques et Formes Différentielles Positives*. Dunod, 1968.

[20] Mikhail Ljubich. Entropy properties of rational endomorphisms of the riemann sphere. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 3(3):351–385, 1983.

[21] Bernard Malgrange. *Ideals of Differentiable Functions*. Oxford University Press, 1966.

[22] S. Morosawa, Y. Nishimura, M. Taniguchi, and T. Ueda. *Holomorphic Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[23] Rodrigo Parra. *Currents and equidistribution in holomorphic dynamics*. PhD thesis, Univ. of Michigan, 2011.

[24] Alexander Russakovskii and Bernard Shiffman. Value distribution for sequences of rational mappings and complex dynamics. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 46(3):897–932, 1997.

[25] Nessim Sibony. Dynamique des applications rationnelles de $\mathbb{P}^k$. *Panoramas & Synthèses*, 8:97–185, 1999.

[26] Johan Taflin. Equidistribution speed towards the green current for endomorphisms of $\mathbb{P}^k$. *Adv. Math.*, 227(5):2059–2081, 2011.

[27] Paul R. Thie. The lelong number of a point of a complex analytic set. *Math. Ann.*, 172, 1967.

Center for Geometry and its Applications and Department of Mathematics, POSTECH, Pohang City 790-784, The Republic of Korea

E-mail address: `triumph@postech.ac.kr`